arXiv:1303.0057v1 [math.CA] 1 Mar 2013

Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy Spaces Associated with Operators Satisfying Reinforced Off-Diagonal Estimates

The Anh Bui, Jun Cao, Luong Dang Ky, Dachun Yang* and Sibei Yang

Abstract Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a metric space with doubling measure and L a one-to-one operator of type ω having a bounded H_∞-functional calculus in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying the reinforced (p_L, q_L) off-diagonal estimates on balls, where $p_L \in [1,2)$ and $q_L \in (2,\infty]$. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ be a function such that $\varphi(x,\cdot)$ is an Orlicz function, $\varphi(\cdot,t) \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\mathcal{X})$ (the class of uniformly Muckenhoupt weights), its uniformly critical upper type index $I(\varphi) \in (0,1]$ and $\varphi(\cdot,t)$ satisfies the uniformly reverse Hölder inequality of order $(q_L/I(\varphi))'$, where $(q_L/I(\varphi))'$ denotes the conjugate exponent of $q_L/I(\varphi)$. In this paper, the authors introduce a Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$, via the Lusin-area function associated with L, and establish its molecular characterization. In particular, when L is nonnegative self-adjoint and satisfies the Davies-Gaffney estimates, the atomic characterization of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ is also obtained. Furthermore, a sufficient condition for the equivalence between $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the classical Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is given. Moreover, for the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated with the second order elliptic operator in divergence form on $\mathbb{R}^n$ or the Schrödinger operator $L := -\Delta + V$ with $0 \le V \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the authors further obtain its several equivalent characterizations in terms of various non-tangential and radial maximal functions; finally, the authors show that the Riesz transform $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to the Musielak-Orlicz space $L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) \in (0,1]$, from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) \in (\frac{n}{n+1}, 1]$, and from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to the weak Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) = \frac{n}{n+1}$ is attainable and $\varphi(\cdot,t) \in \mathbb{A}_1(\mathcal{X})$, where $i(\varphi)$ denotes the uniformly critical lower type index of φ.

1 Introduction

The real-variable theory of Hardy spaces $H^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $p \in (0,1]$, introduced by Stein and Weiss [70] and systematically developed in the seminal paper of Fefferman and Stein [31], plays a center role in various fields of harmonic analysis and partial differential equations (see, for example, [21, 66] and the references therein). One of the main features of the Hardy space $H^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $p \in (0,1]$ is their atomic decomposition characterizations (see [20] for $n = 1$ and [54] for $n > 1$). Later, the theory of weighted Hardy spaces $H^p_w(\mathbb{R}^n)$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 42B35; Secondary: 42B30, 42B25, 42B20, 35J10, 46E30, 47B38, 47B06, 30L99.

Key words and phrases. Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space, molecule, atom, maximal function, Lusin area function, Schrödinger operator, elliptic operator, Riesz transform.

Dachun Yang is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation (Grant No. 11171027) of China and Program for Changjiang Scholars and Innovative Research Team in University of China.

*Corresponding author

with Muckenhoupt weights w has been studied by García-Cuerva [33], and Strömberg and Torchinsky [69]. Furthermore, Strömberg [68] and Janson [44] introduced the Orlicz-Hardy space which play an important role in studying the theory of nonlinear PDEs (see, for example, [36, 43, 13, 14, 16]). Recently, in [49], the last two authors of the present paper studied Hardy spaces of Musielak-Orlicz type which generalize the Orlicz-Hardy space in [68, 44] and the weighted Hardy spaces in [33, 69]. Furthermore, several real-variable characterizations of the Hardy spaces of Musielak-Orlicz type were established in [56, 42]. Moreover, the local Hardy space of Musielak-Orlicz type was studied in [73]. It is worth pointing out that Musielak-Orlicz functions are the natural generalization of Orlicz functions (see, for example, [28, 29, 49, 59]) and the motivation to study function spaces of Musielak-Orlicz type is attributed to their extensive applications to many fields of mathematics (see, for example, [13, 14, 15, 16, 28, 29, 49, 50, 55] for more details). However, it is now understood that there are many settings in which the theory of the spaces of Hardy type can not be applicable; for example, the Riesz transform $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ may not be bounded from $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $L := -\mathrm{div}(A\nabla)$ is a second order divergence elliptic operator with complex bounded measurable coefficients (see, for example, [40]).

Recently, there has been a lot of studies which pay attention to the theory of function spaces associated with operators. In many applications, the very dependence on the function spaces associated with the operators provides many advantages in studying the boundedness of singular integrals which may not fall within the scope of the classical Calderón-Zygmund theory. Here, we would like to give a brief overview of this research direction. Let L be an infinitesimal generator of an analytic semigroup $\{e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ whose kernels satisfy the Gaussian upper bound estimates. The theory on Hardy spaces associated with such operators L was investigated in [5, 30]. Later, Hardy spaces associated with operators which satisfy the weaker conditions, so called Davies-Gaffney estimate conditions, were treated in the works of Auscher et al. [8], Hofmann and Mayboroda [40] and Hofmann et al. [39, 41]. In [46, 45, 47, 57, 71, 72, 73, 74], the authors studied the Orlicz-Hardy spaces associated with operators and, in some sense, these results are extensions to Hardy spaces associated with operators. Then, the weighted Hardy spaces associated with operators were also considered in [67] and [17]. Recently, in [74], the last two authors of this paper studied the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy spaces associated with nonnegative self-adjoint operators satisfying Davies-Gaffney estimates. Furthermore, some special Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy spaces associated with the Schrödinger operator $L := -\Delta + V$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, where the nonnegative potential V satisfies the reverse Hölder inequality of order $n/2$, were studied by the third author of this paper [51, 52, 53] and further applied to the study of commutators of singular integral operators associated with the operator L. Very recently, the authors of this paper [12] studied the weighted Hardy space associated with nonnegative self-adjoint operators satisfying the reinforced off-diagonal estimates on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see Assumption (B) for their definitions in the present setting), which improves these results in [67, 17, 74] in some sense by essentially extending the range of the considered weights.

We would like to describe partly the results in [74] which may be closely related to this paper. Let L be a nonnegative self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying Davies-Gaffney estimates, where $\mathcal{X}$ denotes a metric space with doubling measure. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times [0, \infty) \to$

$[0,\infty)$ be a function such that $\varphi(x,\cdot)$ is an Orlicz function, $\varphi(\cdot,t)\in\mathbb{A}_\infty(\mathcal{X})$ (the class of uniformly Muckenhoupt weights), its uniformly critical upper type index $I(\varphi)\in(0,1]$ and $\varphi(\cdot,t)$ satisfies the uniformly reverse Hölder inequality of order $2/[2-I(\varphi)]$ (see Subsection 2.2 below for these definitions). A typical example of such a φ is

$$\varphi(x,t):=w(x)\Phi(t) \tag{1.1}$$

for all $x\in\mathcal{X}$ and $t\in[0,\infty)$, where $w\in A_\infty(\mathcal{X})$ (the *class of Muckenhoupt weights*) and Φ is an Orlicz function on $[0,\infty)$ of upper type 1 and lower type $p\in(0,1]$ (see Section 2.2 below for the definition of types). Let $x_0\in\mathcal{X}$. Another typical and useful example of such a φ is

$$\varphi(x,t):=\frac{t^\alpha}{[\ln(e+d(x,x_0))]^\beta+[\ln(e+t)]^\gamma} \tag{1.2}$$

for all $x\in\mathcal{X}$ and $t\in[0,\infty)$, with some $\alpha\in(0,1]$, $\beta\in[0,n)$ and $\gamma\in[0,2\alpha(1+\ln 2)]$ (see Section 2.2 for more details). Then, the last two authors of the present paper [74] introduced a Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$, via the Lusin-area function associated with L, and obtained two equivalent characterizations of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ in terms of the atom and the molecule. Hence, it is natural to raise the question *when the condition* $\varphi(x,\cdot)\in\mathbb{RH}_{2/[2-I(\varphi)]}(\mathcal{X})$ *can be relaxed.* One of the main aims of this paper is to give an affirmative answer to this question.

Moreover, motivated by [12, 74, 7, 18], in this paper, we consider more general operators by assuming that the considered operator satisfies **Assumptions (A)** and **(B)** in Subsection 2.3 of this paper. Indeed, Assumption (A) is weaker than "the nonnegative and self-adjoint" condition imposing on the operator L in [74]. Meanwhile, in Assumption (B), we first introduce the notion of the *reinforced* (p_L,q_L,m) *off-diagonal estimates on balls* in the spaces of homogeneous type (see Definition 2.7 below), which is quite wide so that it can provide a framework to treat almost the results in previous works (see, for example, [5, 30, 40, 39, 46, 45, 74, 12]). Under Assumptions (A) and (B), we first introduce the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ (see Definition 4.1 below), via the Lusin-area function associated with L, and then characterize the spaces of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ in terms of the molecular with $\varphi(x,\cdot)\in\mathbb{RH}_{(q_L/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$ (see Theorem 4.8 below), where $(q_L/I(\varphi))'$ denotes the conjugate exponent of $q_L/I(\varphi)$. In particular, when L is nonnegative self-adjoint and satisfies the Davies-Gaffney estimates, the atomic characterization of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ is also obtained (see Theorem 5.4 below). It is important to notice that $\mathbb{RH}_{2/[2-I(\varphi)]}(\mathcal{X})\subset\mathbb{RH}_{(q_L/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$ whenever $q_L>2$ and hence the results in this paper improve significantly those in [74], by enlarging the range of the weights. In particular case, if the heat kernels associated with $\{e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$ satisfy the Gaussian upper bound estimate, then $p_L=1$ and $q_L=\infty$ and hence the class of φ can be extended to $\varphi(x,\cdot)\in\mathbb{A}_\infty(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, we also give a sufficient conditions on L so that our Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ coincides with the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_\varphi(\mathcal{X})$ introduced by the third author of this paper in [49] when $\mathcal{X}:=\mathbb{R}^n$ (see Theorem 6.7 below). As applications, we consider Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ in some particular cases, for example, L being the second order elliptic operator in divergence form or the Schrödinger operator. More precisely, for the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated with the second order elliptic operator in divergence form on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with bounded measurable complex coefficients or the Schrödinger operator $L := -\Delta + V$, where $0 \le V \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we further obtain its several equivalent characterizations in terms of the non-tangential and the radial maximal functions (see Theorems 7.5 and 8.3 below); finally, we show that the Riesz transform $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to the Musielak-Orlicz space $L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) \in (0, 1]$, from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $H_{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) \in (\frac{n}{n+1}, 1]$, and from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to the weak Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $WH_{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) = \frac{n}{n+1}$ is attainable and $\varphi(\cdot, t) \in \mathbb{A}_1(\mathcal{X})$ (see Theorems 7.8, 7.11, 8.5 and 8.6 below), where $i(\varphi)$ denotes the uniformly critical lower type index of φ.

One of the new ingredients appeared in this paper is the introduction of the notion of the reinforced (p_L, q_L, m) off-diagonal estimates on balls in spaces of homogeneous type with $m \in \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \ldots\}$. We remark that, to study the weighted Hardy space $H^p_{\omega}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ on the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ and to relax the range of the weight ω as wide as possible, the authors introduced a notion of the reinforced (p_L, q_L) off-diagonal estimates in [12], which is particular useful for studying the weighted Hardy space associated with various differential operators of second order in the setting of Euclidean spaces. However, if we consider the differential operators on some more general spaces (for example, the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the Riemannian manifold with doubling property), the reinforced (p_L, q_L) off-diagonal estimates in [12] seem no longer suitable (see Remark 2.9(a)). To overcome this difficulty, we introduce the reinforced (p_L, q_L, m) off-diagonal estimates on balls by combining the ideas of the reinforced (p_L, q_L) off-diagonal estimates from [12] and the off-diagonal estimates on balls from [7]. Also, the order $m \in \mathbb{N}$ makes many differential operators of higher order fall into our scope (see Remark 2.9(c)). We also point out that, in [39, 45], the authors introduced a Hardy space associated with operators L in the space of homogenous type by assuming that L satisfies the so called Davies-Gaffney estimates. However, due to the fact that Davies-Gaffney estimates are equivalent to L^2-L^2 off-diagonal estimates on balls (see Remark 5.1(ii)), their Hardy spaces can be viewed as a special case of ours.

Another interesting ingredient appeared in this paper is the discussion of the role of the $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ norm in the definitions of the Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ and the atomic or the molecular Hardy space. This discussion has two aspects, the first one is from [12], where the authors asked the question that what happen if we replace $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $q \neq 2$ in the definition of the Hardy space. For this question, in the present setting, we prove that the space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ is invariant when we do this replacement for all $q \in (p_L,\, q_L)$ (see Theorem 4.9), which coincides with the result obtained in [12] when $\varphi(x,\, t) := t^p w(x)$, for $p \in (0,\, 1]$. The second aspect of this discussion can be reduced to the following question: "*what happen if we replace the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$-convergence of the atomic (resp. molecular) representation by the $L^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$-convergence with $s \neq 2$ in the definition of the the atomic and molecular Hardy space?*" This question arises naturally when we study the boundedness of the fractional integral between two different Hardy spaces. For this question, we prove that the atomic and molecular Hardy spaces are invariant when we do this replacement for all $s \in (p_L,\, q_L)$ (see Theorems 5.9 and 4.8).

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we discuss the settings which are considered in this papers. This includes the assumptions for the function φ and the operator L. Then, we establish the results on the $L^p(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of two square functions which is useful in what follows.

Section 3 is dedicated to studying the Musielak-Orlicz tent spaces. Like the classical result for the tent spaces, we also give out the atomic decomposition for the Musielak-Orlicz tent spaces.

In Section 4, we first introduce the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ via the Lusin-area function and prove that the operator $\pi_{L,\,M}$ (see (4.2) below for its definition) maps the Musielak-Orlicz tent space $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$ continuously into the space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ (see Proposition 4.5 below), here and in what follows, $\mathcal{X}_+ := \mathcal{X} \times (0,\infty)$. By this and the atomic decomposition of the space $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$, we establish the molecular characterization of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ (see Theorem 4.8 below). Moreover, similar to [12, Theorem 3.4], we show that $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ is invariant if we replace $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ by $L^q(\mathcal{X})$ with $q \in (p_L, q_L)$ in the definition of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ (see Theorem 4.9 below). As a consequence, we see that $L^s(\mathcal{X}) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ whenever $s \in (p_L, q_L)$ (see Corollary 4.10 below).

If L is a nonnegative self-adjoint operator in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying the reinforced $(p_L, p_L', 1)$ off-diagonal estimates on balls with $p_L \in [1,2)$, in Section 5, we establish the atomic characterization of the space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ (see Theorem 5.4 below) by using the finite propagation speed for the wave equation and a similar method used in Section 4.

The aim of Section 6 is to give an affirmative answer to the question "*when do the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide?*". More precisely, if the distribution kernel of the heat semigroup $\{e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$ satisfies the Gaussian upper bound estimate, some Hölder regularity and the conservation (see Assumption (C) below for details), then the spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms (see Theorem 6.7 below).

In Section 7, as a special case, we further study the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated with the second order elliptic operator in divergence on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with complex bounded measurable coefficients. By making full use of the special structure of the divergence form elliptic operator and establishing a good-λ inequality concerning the non-tangential maximal function and the truncated Lusin-area function, we obtain the radial and the non-tangential maximal function characterizations of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see Theorem 7.5 below). We remark that the proof of Theorem 7.5 is similar to that of [74, Theorem 7.4] (see also the proof of [72, Proposition 3.2]). Theorem 7.5 completely covers [46, Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.1] by taking φ as in (1.1) with $w \equiv 1$ and Φ concave. Moreover, we prove that the Riesz transform $\nabla L^{-1/2}$, associated with L, is bounded from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) \in (0,1]$, from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) \in (\frac{n}{n+1}, 1]$, and from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to the weak Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $i(\varphi) = \frac{n}{n+1}$ and is attainable (see Theorems 7.8 and 7.11 below). We point out that Theorem 7.8 completely covers [46, Theorems 7.1 and 7.4] by taking completely cover [45, Theorems 5.1 and 5.2] by taking φ as in (1.1) with $w \equiv 1$ and Φ concave. Theorem 7.11 completely covers [19, Theorem 1.2] by taking φ as in (1.1) with $w \equiv 1$ and $\Phi(t) := t^{n/(n+1)}$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$.

In Section 8, we consider the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated with the Schrödinger operator $L := -\Delta + V$, where $0 \le V \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Similar to Section 7, we establish several equivalent characterizations of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in terms of the radial and the non-tangential maximal functions associated with the heat and the Poisson semigroups of L (see Theorem 8.3 below). Moreover, we also study the boundedness of $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ on the space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see Theorems 8.5 and 8.6 below). It is worth pointing out that Theorems 8.3 and 8.5, respectively, improve [74, Theorem 7.4] and [74, Theorems 7.11 and 7.15] by extending the range of weights (see Remarks 8.4 and 8.7 below for details).

Finally we make some conventions on notation. Throughout the whole paper, we denote by C a *positive constant* which is independent of the main parameters, but it may vary from line to line. We also use $C_{(\gamma,\beta,\ldots)}$ to denote a *positive constant depending on the indicated parameters* γ, β, ... The *symbol* $A \lesssim B$ means that $A \le CB$. If $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$, then we write $A \sim B$. The *symbol* $\lfloor s \rfloor$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the maximal integer not more than s. For any given normed spaces $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ with the corresponding norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}}$, the *symbol* $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ means that for all $f \in \mathcal{A}$, then $f \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{A}}$. Also given $\lambda > 0$, we write λB for the λ-dilated ball, which is the ball with the same center as B and with radius $r_{\lambda B} = \lambda r_B$. We also set $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$. For each ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$, we set

$$S_0(B) = B \text{ and } S_j(B) = 2^j B \setminus 2^{j-1} B$$

for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. For any measurable subset E of $\mathcal{X}$, we denote by $E^{\complement}$ the *set* $\mathcal{X} \setminus E$ and by χ_E its *characteristic function*. For any $\theta := (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, let $|\theta| := \theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_n$. For any subsets E, $F \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $z \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$d(E,F) := \inf_{x\in E,\, y\in F} d(x,y) \text{ and } d(z,E) := \inf_{x\in E} d(z,x).$$

For $1 \le q \le \infty$, we denote by q' the *conjugate exponent* of q, namely, $1/q + 1/q' = 1$. Finally, we use the notation

$$⨍_B h(x)\,d\mu(x) := \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B h(x)\,d\mu(x).$$

2 Preliminaries

In Subsection 2.1, we first recall some notions on metric measure spaces and then, in Subsection 2.2, we state some notions and assumptions concerning growth functions considered in this paper and give some examples which satisfy these assumptions; finally, we recall some properties of growth functions established in [49]. In Subsection 2.3, we describe some basic assumptions on the operator L studied in this paper and then study the $L^p(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of two square functions associated with L.

2.1 Metric measure spaces

Throughout the whole paper, we let $\mathcal{X}$ be a *set*, d a *metric* on $\mathcal{X}$ and μ a *nonnegative Borel regular measure* on $\mathcal{X}$. For all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0,\infty)$, let

$$B(x,r) := \{y \in \mathcal{X} :\ d(x,y) < r\}$$

and $V(x,r) := \mu(B(x,r))$. Moreover, we assume that there exists a constant $C \in [1,\infty)$ such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0,\infty)$,

$$V(x,2r) \le CV(x,r) < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

Observe that $(\mathcal{X},\, d,\, \mu)$ is a *space of homogeneous type* in the sense of Coifman and Weiss [23]. Recall that in the definition of spaces of homogeneous type in [23, Chapter 3], d is assumed to be a quasi-metric. However, for simplicity, we always assume that d is a metric. Notice that the doubling property (2.1) implies that the following strong homogeneity property that, for some positive constants C and n,

$$V(x,\lambda r) \le C\lambda^n V(x,r) \tag{2.2}$$

uniformly for all $\lambda \in [1,\infty)$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0,\infty)$. There also exist constants $C \in (0,\infty)$ and $N \in [0,n]$ such that, for all x, $y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r \in (0,\infty)$,

$$V(x,r) \le C\left[1 + \frac{d(x,y)}{r}\right]^N V(y,r). \tag{2.3}$$

Indeed, the property (2.3) with $N = n$ is a simple corollary of the triangle inequality for the metric d and the strong homogeneity property (2.2). In the cases of Euclidean spaces and Lie groups of polynomial growth, N can be chosen to be 0.

Furthermore, for $p \in (0,\infty]$, the *space of p-integrable functions on $\mathcal{X}$* is denoted by $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ and the *(quasi-)norm* of $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ by $\|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}$.

2.2 Growth functions

Recall that a function $\Phi : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is called an *Orlicz function* if it is nondecreasing, $\Phi(0) = 0$, $\Phi(t) > 0$ for $t \in (0,\infty)$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \Phi(t) = \infty$ (see, for example, [59, 62, 63]). The function Φ is said to be of *upper type p* (resp. *lower type p*) for some $p \in [0,\infty)$, if there exists a positive constant C such that for all $s \in [1,\infty)$ (resp. $s \in [0,1]$) and $t \in [0,\infty)$, $\Phi(st) \le Cs^p\Phi(t)$.

For a given function $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\varphi(x,\cdot)$ is an Orlicz function, φ is said to be of *uniformly upper type p* (resp. *uniformly lower type p*) for some $p \in [0,\infty)$ if there exists a positive constant C such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ and $s \in [1,\infty)$ (resp. $s \in [0,1]$), $\varphi(x,st) \le Cs^p\varphi(x,t)$. We say that φ is of *positive uniformly upper type* (resp. *uniformly lower type*) if it is of uniformly upper type (resp. uniformly lower type) p for some $p \in (0,\infty)$. Moreover, let

$$I(\varphi) := \inf\{p \in (0,\infty) :\ \varphi \text{ is of uniformly upper type } p\} \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$i(\varphi) := \sup\{p \in (0,\infty) :\ \varphi \text{ is of uniformly lower type } p\}. \tag{2.5}$$

In what follows, $I(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are, respectively, called the *uniformly critical upper type index* and the *uniformly critical lower type index* of φ. Observe that $I(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ may not be attainable, namely, φ may not be of uniformly upper type $I(\varphi)$ and uniformly lower type $i(\varphi)$ (see below for some examples).

Let $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ satisfy that $x \mapsto \varphi(x,t)$ is measurable for all $t \in [0,\infty)$. Following [49], $\varphi(\cdot,t)$ is called *uniformly locally integrable* if, for all bounded sets K in $\mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_K \sup_{t\in(0,\infty)} \left\{\varphi(x,t)\left[\int_K \varphi(y,t)\,d\mu(y)\right]^{-1}\right\} d\mu(x) < \infty.$$

Definition 2.1. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{X}\times[0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ be uniformly locally integrable. The function $\varphi(\cdot,t)$ is said to satisfy the *uniformly Muckenhoupt condition for some* $q \in [1,\infty)$, denoted by $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_q(\mathcal{X})$, if, when $q \in (1,\infty)$,

$$\mathbb{A}_q(\varphi) := \sup_{t\in(0,\infty)} \sup_{B\subset\mathcal{X}} \fint_B \varphi(x,t)\,d\mu(x) \left\{\fint_B [\varphi(y,t)]^{-q'/q}\,d\mu(y)\right\}^{q/q'} < \infty,$$

where $1/q + 1/q' = 1$, or

$$\mathbb{A}_1(\varphi) := \sup_{t\in(0,\infty)} \sup_{B\subset\mathcal{X}} \fint_B \varphi(x,t)\,d\mu(x) \left(\operatorname*{esssup}_{y\in B}\,[\varphi(y,t)]^{-1}\right) < \infty.$$

Here the first supremums are taken over all $t \in (0,\infty)$ and the second ones over all balls $B \subset \mathcal{X}$.

The function $\varphi(\cdot,t)$ is said to satisfy the *uniformly reverse Hölder condition for some* $q \in (1,\infty]$, denoted by $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_q(\mathcal{X})$, if, when $q \in (1,\infty)$,

$$\mathbb{RH}_q(\varphi) : = \sup_{t\in(0,\infty)} \sup_{B\subset\mathcal{X}} \left\{\fint_B [\varphi(x,t)]^q\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/q} \left\{\fint_B \varphi(x,t)\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{-1} < \infty,$$

or

$$\mathbb{RH}_\infty(\varphi) := \sup_{t\in(0,\infty)} \sup_{B\subset\mathcal{X}} \left\{\operatorname*{esssup}_{y\in B}\,\varphi(y,t)\right\} \left\{\fint_B \varphi(x,t)\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{-1} < \infty.$$

Here the first supremums are taken over all $t \in (0,\infty)$ and the second ones over all balls $B \subset \mathcal{X}$.

Let $\mathbb{A}_\infty(\mathcal{X}) := \cup_{q\in[1,\infty)}\mathbb{A}_q(\mathcal{X})$ and define the *critical indices* of $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_\infty(\mathcal{X})$ as follows:

$$q(\varphi) := \inf\{q \in [1,\infty) :\ \varphi \in \mathbb{A}_q(\mathcal{X})\} \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$r(\varphi) := \sup\{q \in (1,\infty] :\ \varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_q(\mathcal{X})\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Now we introduce the notion of growth functions.

Definition 2.2. A function $\varphi :\ \mathcal{X} \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is called a *growth function* if the following hold true:

(i) φ is a *Musielak-Orlicz function*, namely,
  - (i)$_1$ the function $\varphi(x,\cdot):\ [0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ is an Orlicz function for all $x\in\mathcal{X}$;
  - (i)$_2$ the function $\varphi(\cdot,t)$ is a measurable function for all $t\in[0,\infty)$.

(ii) $\varphi\in\mathbb{A}_\infty(\mathcal{X})$.

(iii) The function φ is of positive uniformly upper type 1 and of uniformly lower type p_2 for some $p_2\in(0,1]$.

Remark 2.3. From the definitions of the uniformly upper type and the uniformly lower type, we deduce that, if the growth function φ is of positive uniformly upper type p_1 with $p_1\in(0,1]$, and of positive uniformly lower type p_2 with $p_2\in(0,1]$, then $p_1\ge p_2$.

Clearly, $\varphi(x,t):=\omega(x)\Phi(t)$ is a growth function if $\omega\in A_\infty(\mathcal{X})$ and Φ is an Orlicz function of lower type p for some $p\in(0,1]$ and of upper type 1. It is known that, for $p\in(0,1]$, if $\Phi(t):=t^p$ for all $t\in[0,\infty)$, then Φ is an Orlicz function of lower type p and of upper type p; for $p\in[\frac12,1]$, if $\Phi(t):=t^p/\ln(e+t)$ for all $t\in[0,\infty)$, then Φ is an Orlicz function of lower type q for $q\in(0,p)$ and of upper type p; for $p\in(0,\frac12]$, if $\Phi(t):=t^p\ln(e+t)$ for all $t\in[0,\infty)$, then Φ is an Orlicz function of lower type p and of upper type q for $q\in(p,1]$. Recall that if an Orlicz function is of upper type $p\in(0,1)$, then it is also of upper type 1.

Another typical and useful example of the growth function φ is as in (1.2). It is easy to show that $\varphi\in\mathbb{A}_1(\mathcal{X})$, φ is of uniformly upper type α, $I(\varphi)=i(\varphi)=\alpha$, $i(\varphi)$ is not attainable, but $I(\varphi)$ is attainable. Moreover, it worths to point out that such function φ naturally appears in the study of the pointwise multiplier characterization for the BMO-type space on the metric space with doubling measure (see [60, 61]); see also [50, 51, 52, 53] for some other applications of such functions.

Throughout the whole paper, we *always assume that φ is a growth function* as in Definition 2.2. Let us now introduce the Musielak-Orlicz space.

The *Musielak-Orlicz space $L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$* is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f such that $\int_{\mathcal{X}}\varphi(x,|f(x)|)\,d\mu(x)<\infty$ with *Luxembourg norm*

$$\|f\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}:=\inf\left\{\lambda\in(0,\infty):\ \int_{\mathcal{X}}\varphi\left(x,\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda}\right)\,d\mu(x)\le1\right\}.$$

In what follows, for any measurable subset E of $\mathcal{X}$ and $t\in[0,\infty)$, we let

$$\varphi(E,t):=\int_E\varphi(x,t)\,d\mu(x).$$

The following Lemma 2.4 on the properties of growth functions is just [49, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2].

Lemma 2.4. (i) *Let φ be a growth function as in Definition 2.2. Then φ is uniformly σ-quasi-subadditive on $\mathcal{X}\times[0,\infty)$, namely, there exists a positive constant C such that, for all $(x,t_j)\in\mathcal{X}\times[0,\infty)$ with $j\in\mathbb{N}$, $\varphi(x,\sum_{j=1}^\infty t_j)\le C\sum_{j=1}^\infty\varphi(x,t_j)$.*

(ii) *Let φ be a growth function as in Definition 2.2. For all $(x,t)\in\mathcal{X}\times[0,\infty)$, assume that $\widetilde{\varphi}(x,t):=\int_0^t\frac{\varphi(x,s)}{s}\,ds$. Then $\widetilde{\varphi}$ is a growth function, which is equivalent to φ; moreover, $\widetilde{\varphi}(x,\cdot)$ is continuous and strictly increasing.*

(iii) *Let* φ *be a growth function as in Definition 2.2. Then* $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi(x, \frac{|f(x)|}{\|f\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}})\, d\mu(x) = 1$ *for all* $f \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \{0\}$.

We have the following properties for $\mathbb{A}_{\infty}(\mathcal{X})$, whose proofs are similar to those in [34, 35].

Lemma 2.5. (i) $\mathbb{A}_1(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathbb{A}_p(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathbb{A}_q(\mathcal{X})$ *for* $1 \le p \le q < \infty$.

(ii) $\mathbb{RH}_{\infty}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathbb{RH}_p(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathbb{RH}_q(\mathcal{X})$ *for* $1 < q \le p \le \infty$.

(iii) *If* $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_p(\mathcal{X})$ *with* $p \in (1, \infty)$, *then there exists* $q \in (1, p)$ *such that* $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_q(\mathcal{X})$.

(iv) *If* $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_q(\mathcal{X})$ *with* $q \in (1, \infty)$, *then there exists* $p \in (q, \infty)$ *such that* $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_p(\mathcal{X})$.

(v) $\mathbb{A}_{\infty}(\mathcal{X}) = \cup_{p \in [1,\infty)} \mathbb{A}_p(\mathcal{X}) \subset \cup_{q \in (1,\infty]} \mathbb{RH}_q(\mathcal{X})$.

(vi) *If* $p \in (1, \infty)$ *and* $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_p(\mathcal{X})$, *then there exists a positive constant* C *such that, for all measurable functions* f *on* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} [\mathcal{M}(f)(x)]^p \, \varphi(x,t)\, d\mu(x) \le C \int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(x)|^p \varphi(x,t)\, d\mu(x),$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ *denotes the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function on* $\mathcal{X}$, *defined by setting, for all* $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\mathcal{M}(f)(x) := \sup_{x \in B} \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |f(y)|\, d\mu(y),$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B \ni x$.

(vii) *If* $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_p(\mathcal{X})$ *with* $p \in [1, \infty)$, *then there exists a positive constant* C *such that, for all balls* B_1, $B_2 \subset \mathcal{X}$ *with* $B_1 \subset B_2$ *and* $t \in [0, \infty)$, $\frac{\varphi(B_2,t)}{\varphi(B_1,t)} \le C[\frac{\mu(B_2)}{\mu(B_1)}]^p$.

(viii) *If* $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_q(\mathcal{X})$ *with* $q \in (1, \infty]$, *then there exists a positive constant* C *such that, for all balls* B_1, $B_2 \subset \mathcal{X}$ *with* $B_1 \subset B_2$ *and* $t \in [0, \infty)$, $\frac{\varphi(B_2,t)}{\varphi(B_1,t)} \ge C[\frac{\mu(B_2)}{\mu(B_1)}]^{(q-1)/q}$.

Remark 2.6. By Lemma 2.5(iii), we see that if $q(\varphi) \in (1, \infty)$, then $\varphi \notin \mathbb{A}_{q(\varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, there exists $\varphi \notin \mathbb{A}_1(\mathcal{X})$ such that $q(\varphi) = 1$ (see, for example, [48]). Similarly, if $r(\varphi) \in (1, \infty)$, then $\varphi \notin \mathbb{RH}_{r(\varphi)}(\mathcal{X})$, and there exists $\varphi \notin \mathbb{RH}_{\infty}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $r(\varphi) = \infty$ (see, for example, [26]).

2.3 Two assumptions on the operator L

Before giving the assumptions on operators L, we first recall some notions of bounded holomorphic functional calculus introduced by McIntosh [58].

For $\theta \in [0, \pi)$, the *open* and *closed sectors*, S_{θ}^0 and S_{θ}, of angle θ in the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ are defined, respectively, by setting $S_{\theta}^0 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} : \ |\arg z| < \theta\}$ and $S_{\theta} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ |\arg z| \le \theta\}$. Let $\omega \in [0, \pi)$. A closed operator T in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is said to be of *type* ω, if

(i) the *spectrum* of T, $\sigma(T)$, is contained in S_{ω};

(ii) for each $\theta \in (\omega, \pi)$, there exists a nonnegative constant C such that, for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{\theta}$,

$$\left\|(T - zI)^{-1}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{X}))} \le C|z|^{-1},$$

where above and in what follows, for any normed linear space $\mathcal{H}$, $\|S\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}$ denotes the *operator norm* of the linear operator $S : \ \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$.

For $\mu\in[0,\,\pi)$ and $\sigma,\tau\in(0,\,\infty)$, let $H(S_\mu^0):=\{f:\ f \text{ is a holomorphic function on } S_\mu^0\}$,

$$H_\infty(S_\mu^0):=\left\{f\in H(S_\mu^0):\ \|f\|_{L^\infty(S_\mu^0)}<\infty\right\}$$

and

$$\Psi_{\sigma,\,\tau}(S_\mu^0):=\big\{f\in H(S_\mu^0):\ \text{there exists a positive constant } C \text{ such that for all } \xi\in S_\mu^0,\ |f(\xi)|\le C\inf\{|\xi|^\sigma,\,|\xi|^{-\tau}\}\big\}.$$

It is known that every one-to-one operator T of type ω in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ has a unique holomorphic functional calculus (see, for example, [58]). More precisely, let T be a one-to-one operator of type ω, with $\omega\in[0,\,\pi)$, $\mu\in(\omega,\,\pi)$, $\sigma,\,\tau\in(0,\,\infty)$ and $f\in\Psi_{\sigma,\tau}(S_\mu^0)$. The *function of the operator* T, $f(T)$, can be defined by the H_∞-functional calculus in the following way,

$$f(T):=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\Gamma(\xi I-T)^{-1}f(\xi)\,d\xi, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\Gamma:=\{re^{i\nu}:\ \infty>r>0\}\cup\{re^{-i\nu}:\ 0<r<\infty\}$, $\nu\in(\omega,\,\mu)$, is a curve consisting of two rays parameterized anti-clockwise. It is known that $f(T)$ in (2.8) is independent of the choice of $\nu\in(\omega,\,\mu)$ and the integral in (2.8) is absolutely convergent in $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{X}))}$ (see [58, 38]).

In what follows, we *always assume* $\omega\in[0,\,\pi/2)$. Then, it follows, from [38, Proposition 7.1.1], that for every operator T of type ω in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, $-T$ generates a holomorphic C_0-semigroup $\{e^{-zT}\}_{z\in S^0_{\pi/2-\omega}}$ on the open sector $S^0_{\pi/2-\omega}$ such that $\|e^{-zT}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{X}))}\le1$ for all $z\in S^0_{\pi/2-\omega}$ and, moreover, every *nonnegative self-adjoint operator* is of type 0.

Let $\Psi(S_\mu^0):=\cup_{\sigma,\tau>0}\Psi_{\sigma,\,\tau}(S_\mu^0)$. It is well known that the above holomorphic functional calculus defined on $\Psi(S_\mu^0)$ can be extended to $H_\infty(S_\mu^0)$ via a limit process (see [58]). Recall that, for $\mu\in(0,\,\pi)$, the operator T is said to have a *bounded $H_\infty(S_\mu^0)$ functional calculus* in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, if there exists a positive constant C such that, for all $\psi\in H_\infty(S_\mu^0)$, $\|\psi(T)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}\le C\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(S_\mu^0)}$ and T is said to have a *bounded H_∞ functional calculus* in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ if there exists $\mu\in(0,\,\pi)$ such that T has a bounded $H_\infty(S_\mu^0)$ functional calculus.

For any given $f\in L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$, each ball $B\subset\mathcal{X}$ and $j\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, let

$$\fint_{S_j(B)}|f(x)|d\mu(x):=\frac{1}{\mu(2^jB)}\int_{S_j(B)}|f(x)|d\mu(x).$$

Now we recall the notion of L^p-L^q off-diagonal estimates on balls, which was first introduced in [7].

Definition 2.7. Let $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $p,\,q\in[1,\infty]$ with $p\le q$, and $\{A_t\}_{t>0}$ be a family of sublinear operators. The family $\{A_t\}_{t>0}$ is said to satisfy *L^p-L^q off-diagonal estimates on balls of order m*, denoted by $A_t\in\mathcal{O}_m(L^p-L^q)$, if there exist constants $\theta_1,\,\theta_2\in[0,\infty)$ and $C,\,c\in(0,\infty)$ such that, for all $t\in(0,\infty)$ and all balls $B\subset\mathcal{X}$ and $f\in L^p_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\left\{\fint_B|A_t\left(\chi_Bf\right)(x)|^qd\mu(x)\right\}^{1/q}\le C\left[\Upsilon\left(\frac{r_B}{t^{1/2m}}\right)\right]^{\theta_2}\left\{\fint_B|f(x)|^p\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p}, \tag{2.9}$$

and, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \geq 3$,

$$\tag{2.10} \begin{aligned} &\left\{ \fint_{S_j(B)} \left| A_t \left(\chi_B f \right) (x) \right|^q \, d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\quad \leq C 2^{j\theta_1} \left[\Upsilon \left(\frac{2^j r_B}{t^{1/2m}} \right) \right]^{\theta_2} e^{-c \frac{(2^j r_B)^{2m/(2m-1)}}{t^{1/(2m-1)}}} \left\{ \fint_B |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \fint_B |A_t(\chi_{S_j(B)} f)(x)|^q \, d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/q} \\ &\quad \leq C 2^{j\theta_1} \left[\Upsilon \left(\frac{2^j r_B}{t^{1/2m}} \right) \right]^{\theta_2} e^{-c \frac{(2^j r_B)^{2m/(2m-1)}}{t^{1/(2m-1)}}} \left\{ \fint_{S_j(B)} |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x) \right\}^{1/p}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Upsilon(s) := \max\{s, \frac{1}{s}\}$ for all $s \in (0, \infty)$.

Similar to the comments below [7, Definition 2.1], we have the following properties on $\mathcal{O}_m(L^p - L^q)$.

Remark 2.8. (i) It is easy to see that, for $p \leq p_1 \leq q_1 \leq q$,

$$\mathcal{O}_m(L^p - L^q) \subset \mathcal{O}_m(L^{p_1} - L^{q_1}).$$

(ii) Similar to [7, Proposition 2.2], we see that $A_t \in \mathcal{O}_m(L^1 - L^\infty)$ if and only if the associated kernel p_t of A_t satisfies the Gaussian upper bound, namely, there exist positive constants c and C such that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$|p_t(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{V(x, t^{1/2m})} \exp \left\{ -c \frac{[d(x, y)]^{2m/(2m-1)}}{t^{1/(2m-1)}} \right\}.$$

(iii) $A_t \in \mathcal{O}_m(L^p - L^q)$ if and only if its dual, A_t^*, belongs to $\mathcal{O}_m(L^{q'} - L^{p'})$.

Now, we make the following two assumptions on operators L, which are used through the whole paper.

Assumption (A). Assume that the operator L is a one-to-one operator of type ω in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ with $\omega \in [0, \pi/2)$, has dense range in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and a bounded H_∞-calculus in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$.

Assumption (B). Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that there exist $p_L \in [1, 2)$ and $q_L \in (2, \infty]$, depending on L, such that the family $\{(tL)^k e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$, with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, satisfies the *reinforced* (p_L, q_L, m) *off-diagonal estimates on balls*, namely, for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ and $p, q \in (p_L, q_L)$ with $p \leq q$, $(tL)^k e^{-tL} \in \mathcal{O}_m(L^p - L^q)$.

Remark 2.9. (a) We first point that in Assumptions (A) and (B), if L is non-negative self-adjoint, $\mathcal{X}$ is the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $m = 1$, from [7, Proposition 3.2], it follows that the notion of the reinforced $(p_L,\, q_L,\, m)$ off-diagonal estimates on balls is the same as the reinforced $(p_L,\, q_L)$ off-diagonal estimates introduced in [12] (see [11, 27, 32] and their references for the history of the off-diagonal estimates). Here, we use the off-diagonal estimates on balls, because they coincide with the off-diagonal estimates when $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$, and the off-diagonal estimates on balls seem more suitable in a general space of homogeneous type. For example, the heat semigroup $e^{-t\Delta}$ on functions for general Riemannian manifolds with doubling property is not $L^p - L^q$ bounded when $p < q$ unless the measure of any ball is bounded below by a power of its radius. However, if we assume the $L^p - L^q$ off-diagonal estimates, it then implies the $L^p - L^q$ boundedness (see also the discussions above [7, Proposition 3.2]).

(b) Denote by L^* the *adjoint operator* of L in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Let p_L, q_L be as in Assumption (B), $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $(tL)^k e^{-tL}$ satisfies the reinforced $(p_L,\, q_L,\, m)$ off-diagonal estimates on balls, then $(tL^*)^k e^{-tL^*}$ also satisfies the reinforced $(q_L',\, p_L',\, m)$ off-diagonal estimates on balls. Recall that, for any $p \in [1, \infty]$, $1/p + 1/p' = 1$.

(c) Examples of operators which satisfy Assumptions (A) and (B) include:

   (i) the second order divergence form elliptic operators with complex bounded coefficients as in [40] (see also (7.1) below for its precise definition);

   (ii) the $2m$*-order homogeneous divergence form elliptic operators*

$$(-1)^m \sum_{|\alpha|=m=|\beta|} \partial^\beta \left(a_{\alpha,\beta} \partial^\alpha\right)$$

   interpreted in the usual weak sense via a sesquilinear form, with complex bounded measurable coefficients $a_{\alpha,\,\beta}$ for all multi-indices α and β (see, for example, [10, 18]);

   (iii) the *Schrödinger operator* $-\Delta + V$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the nonnegative potential $V \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see, for example, [39, 45] and related references);

   (iv) the *Schrödinger operator* $-\Delta + V$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the suitable real potential V as in [3];

   (v) the nonnegative self-adjoint operators satisfying *Gaussian upper bounds*, namely, there exist positive constants C and c such that, for all $x,\, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$|p_t(x, y)| \le \frac{C}{V(x, t^{1/2m})} \exp\left\{-c \frac{[d(x, y)]^{2m/(2m-1)}}{t^{1/(2m-1)}}\right\},$$

   where p_t is the associated kernel of e^{-tL} and $m \in \mathbb{N}$;

(d) We point out that the condition that L is one-to-one is necessary for the bounded H_∞ functional calculus on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ (see [58, 25]). Moreover, from [25, Theorem 2.3], it follows that if T is a one-to-one operator of type ω in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, then T has dense domain and dense range;

(e) If L is nonnegative self-adjoint on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying the reinforced $(p_L,\, p'_L,\, m)$ off-diagonal estimates on balls, then the condition that L is one-to-one can be removed and we can introduce another kind of functional calculus by using the spectral theorem. More precisely, in this case, for every bounded Borel function $F : [0,\, \infty) \to \mathbb{C}$, we define the operator $F(L) : L^2(\mathcal{X}) \to L^2(\mathcal{X})$ by the formula

$$F(L) := \int_0^\infty F(\lambda)\, dE_L(\lambda),$$

where $E_L(\lambda)$ is the *spectral resolution* of L (see [39] for more details). Observe also that a one-to-one nonnegative self-adjoint operator is of type 0.

Assume that the operator L satisfies Assumptions (A) and (B). For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the *vertical square function* $G_{L,\,k}$ is defined by setting, for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$G_{L,\,k}(f)(x) := \left\{\int_0^\infty \left|(t^{2m}L)^k e^{-t^{2m}L} f(x)\right|^2 \frac{dt}{t}\right\}^{1/2},$$

which is bounded on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ (see, for example, [58]). When $k = 1$, we write G_L instead of $G_{L,\,1}$.

Theorem 2.10. *Let L satisfy Assumptions* (A) *and* (B), *$k \in \mathbb{N}$ and, p_L and q_L be as in Assumption* (B). *Then $G_{L,\,k}$ is bounded on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ for all $p \in (p_L, q_L)$.*

To prove Theorem 2.10, we need the following two criteria, which are due to [4] (see also [6]).

Lemma 2.11. *Let $p_0 \in [1, 2)$ and $\{A_t\}_{t>0}$ be a family of linear operators acting on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Suppose that T is a sublinear operator of strong type $(2, 2)$. Assume that there exists a sequence $\{\alpha(j)\}_{j=2}^\infty$ of positive numbers such that, for all balls $B := B(x_B, r_B)$ and $f \in L^{p_0}(\mathcal{X})$ supported in B,*

$$\left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} |T(I - A_{r_B})f(x)|^2\, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/2} \le \alpha(j) \left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^{p_0}\, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p_0} \tag{2.11}$$

when $j \ge 3$, and

$$\left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} |A_{r_B} f(x)|^2\, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/2} \le \alpha(j) \left\{\fint |f(x)|^{p_0}\, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p_0} \tag{2.12}$$

when $j \ge 2$. If $\sum_{j=2}^\infty \alpha(j) 2^{nj} < \infty$, then T is of weak type (p_0, p_0).

Lemma 2.12. *Let $p_0 \in (2, \infty]$ and $\{A_t\}_{t>0}$ be a family of linear operators acting on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Suppose that T is a sublinear operator acting on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Assume that there exists a positive constant C such that, for all balls $B := B(x_B, r_B)$, $y \in B$ and $f \in L^{p_0}(\mathcal{X})$ supported in B,*

$$\left\{\fint_B |T(I - A_{r_B})f(x)|^{p_0}\, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p_0} \le C \left[\mathcal{M}(|f|^2)(y)\right]^{1/2} \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$\left\{\fint_B |TA_{r_B}f(x)|^{p_0}\, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p_0} \le C[\mathcal{M}(|Tf|^2)(y)]^{1/2},$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ *denotes the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function (see Lemma 2.5(vi)). Then* T *is of strong type* (p_0, p_0).

Now we prove Theorem 2.10 by using Lemmas 2.11 and 2.12.

Proof of Theorem 2.10. For the sake of simplicity, we only give the proof for $k = 1$. Since G_L is bounded on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, we can assume that $p_L < 2 < q_L$. We now consider the following two cases.

Case 1). $p \in (p_L, 2)$.

In this case, we apply Lemma 2.11 with $A_{r_B} := I - (I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M > (n + \theta_1)/2m$. From Assumption (B), we deduce that $e^{-tL} \in \mathcal{O}_m(L^p - L^2)$. Thus, (2.12) holds. It remains to show that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \ge 3$, balls B and $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ supported in B, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} \left|G_L(I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(x)\right|^2 d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/2} \\ \lesssim 2^{-j(mM-\theta_1)} \left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p\, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

First, we write

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} \left|G_L(I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(x)\right|^2 d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/2} \\ &= \left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} \int_0^\infty \left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(x)\right|^2 \frac{dt}{t} d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/2} \\ &\le \left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} \int_0^{2^j r_B} \left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(x)\right|^2 \frac{dt}{t} d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} \int_{2^j r_B}^\infty \cdots\right\}^{1/2} =: \mathrm{I} + \mathrm{II}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

We first estimate I. Write

$$\left(I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L}\right)^M = \int_0^{r_B^m} \cdots \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} L^M e^{-(s_1+\cdots+s_M)L} ds_1 \cdots ds_M.$$

Thus,

$$\mathrm{I} \le \left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} \int_0^{2^j r_B} \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \cdots \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \left|t^{2m}L^{M+1}e^{-(t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)L} f(x)\right|^2 \right. \tag{2.16}$$

$$\times ds_1 \cdots ds_M \frac{dt}{t} d\mu(x)\Bigg\}^{1/2}.$$

By the fact that $((t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)L)^{M+1}e^{-(t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)L} \in \mathcal{O}_m(L^p-L^2)$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} \left|t^{2m}L^{M+1}e^{-(t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)L}f(x)\right|^2 d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/2}\\
&\quad\lesssim \frac{t^{2m}}{(t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)^{M+1}}2^{j\theta_1}\left[\frac{t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M}{(2^jr_B)^{2m}}\right]^{M+1}\left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p}\\
&\quad\lesssim 2^{j\theta_1}t^{2m}(2^jr_B)^{-2m(M+1)}\left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with Minkowski's integral inequality and (2.16), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I} &\lesssim \int_0^{2^jr_B}\int_0^{r_B^{2m}}\cdots\int_0^{r_B^{2m}} 2^{j\theta_1}t^{2m}(2^jr_B)^{-2m(M+1)}ds_1\cdots ds_M\frac{dt}{t}\\
&\quad\times\left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p} \lesssim 2^{-j(2mM-\theta_1)}\left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.17}$$

Likewise, we also see that

$$\mathrm{II} \lesssim 2^{-j(2mM-\theta_1)}\left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p}.$$

This, combined with (2.15) and (2.17), shows that (2.14) holds as long as $M>(n+\theta_1)/2m$. Thus, as a direct consequence of Lemma 2.12 and interpolation, we conclude that G_L is bounded on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ for all $p\in(p_L,\,2)$.

Case 2). $p \in (2,\, q_L)$.

In this case, we first prove (2.13) for $T:=G_L$ and $A_{r_B}:=I-(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M$ with $M>(n+\theta_1)/2m$. To do this, we decompose $f=\sum_{j=0}^\infty f_j$, where for each $j\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, $f_j:=f\chi_{S_j(B)}$. Then, by an argument similar to that used in the proof of Case 1), we conclude that (2.13) holds true for $T:=G_L$ and $A_{r_B}:=I-(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M$ with $M>(n+\theta_1)/2m$. We now claim that, for all $f\in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, balls $B:=B(x_B,r_B)$ and $y\in B$,

$$\left\{\fint_B \left|G_L[I-(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M]f(x)\right|^p\right\}^{1/p} \lesssim \left[\mathcal{M}(|Tf|^2)(y)\right]^{1/2}.\tag{2.18}$$

Since $I-(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M=\sum_{j=1}^M c_{(j,\,M)}e^{-jr_B^{2m}L}$, where $\{c_{(j,\,M)}\}_{j=0}^M$ are constants depending on j and M, it follows that (2.18) is equivalent to that, for all $j\in\{1,\,\ldots,\,M\}$,

$$\left\{\fint_B \left|G_Le^{-jr_B^{2m}L}f(x)\right|^p d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p} \lesssim \left[\mathcal{M}(|Tf|^2)(y)\right]^{1/2}.\tag{2.19}$$

To see this, by Minkowski's inequality, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{\fint_B \left|G_L e^{-jr_B^{2m}L} f(x)\right|^p \,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p}\\&\quad\le \left\{\int_0^\infty \left[\fint_B \left|e^{-jr_B^{2m}L}\left(t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f\right)(x)\right|^p \,d\mu(x)\right]^{2/p}\frac{dt}{t}\right\}^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $g := t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f$ and $g_i := g\chi_{S_i(B)}$ with $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then, from the fact that $e^{-jr_B^{2m}L} \in \mathcal{O}_m(L^2 - L^p)$, we deduce that, for all $y \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{\fint_B \left|G_L e^{-jr_B^{2m}L} f(x)\right|^p \,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p} &\lesssim \left\{\int_0^\infty \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_+}\left[\fint_B \left|e^{-jr_B^{2m}L} g_i(x)\right|^p \,d\mu(x)\right]^{2/p}\frac{dt}{t}\right\}^{1/2}\\&\lesssim \left[\mathcal{M}(|f|^2)(y)\right]^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (2.19) holds and hence (2.18) holds true. By this and Lemma 2.12, we see that G_L is bounded on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ for all $p \in (2,\, q_L)$, which completes the proof of Theorem 2.10. ☐

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the *non-tangential square functions* $S_{L,\,k}$ is defined by setting, for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$S_{L,\,k}(f)(x) := \left\{\int_0^\infty \int_{B(x,t)} \left|(t^{2m}L)^k e^{-t^{2m}L} f(y)\right|^2 \frac{d\mu(y)}{V(x,t)}\frac{dt}{t}\right\}^{1/2}. \tag{2.20}$$

In particular case $k = 1$, we omit the subscript k to write S_L. It is easy to show that, for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, $\|S_{L,\,k}(f)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|G_{L,\,k}(f)\|_{L^2(\mathcal{X})}$ and hence $S_{L,\,k}$ is bounded on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, we have the following boundedness of $S_{L,\,k}$ on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$.

Theorem 2.13. *Let L satisfy Assumptions* (A) *and* (B), *$k \in \mathbb{N}$ and p_L and q_L be as in Assumption* (B). *Then $S_{L,\,k}$ is bounded on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ for all $p \in (p_L,\, q_L)$.*

Proof. Without the loss of generality, we may assume that $k = 1$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.10, we also consider the following two cases for p.

Case 1). $p \in (p_L, 2)$.

In this case, we apply Theorem 2.11 to this situation for $T := S_L$ and $A_{r_B} := I - (I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M$ with $M > (2n + \theta_1)/2m$. Due to the fact that $(tL)^k e^{-tL} \in \mathcal{O}_m(L^p - L^2)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we only need to show (2.12), namely, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \ge 3$, balls $B := B(x_B, r_B)$ and $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ supported in B, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{\fint_{S_j(B)} \left|S_L(I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(x)\right|^2 \,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/2}\\&\qquad\lesssim 2^{-j(2mM-\theta_1)}\left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p \,d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

To show this, we first write

$$\begin{aligned}&\fint_{S_j(B)}\left|S_L(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(x)\right|^2\,d\mu(x)\\&=\fint_{S_j(B)}\int_0^{\frac{d(x,x_B)}{4}}\int_{B(x,t)}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2\,\frac{d\mu(y)}{V(x,t)}\frac{dt}{t}d\mu(x)\\&\quad+\fint_{S_j(B)}\int_{\frac{d(x,x_B)}{4}}^{\infty}\cdots=:\mathrm{I}_1+\mathrm{I}_2.\end{aligned}$$

Let us first estimate I_1. Let

$$F_j(B):=\left\{z\in\mathcal{X}:\text{ there exists } x\in S_j(B)\text{ such that } d(x,z)<\frac{d(x,x_B)}{4}\right\}.$$

Then $F_j(B)\subset S_{j-1}(B)\cup S_j(B)\cup S_{j+1}(B)=:U_j(B)$. This, together with the fact that $\int_{d(x,y)<t}\frac{1}{V(x,t)}d\mu(x)\lesssim 1$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I}_1&\le\frac{1}{\mu(2^jB)}\int_{F_j(B)}\int_0^{\frac{d(x,x_B)}{4}}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I-e^{r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2\,\frac{dt}{t}d\mu(y)\\&\lesssim\frac{1}{\mu(2^jB)}\int_{U_j(B)}\int_0^{2^jr_B}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I-e^{r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2\,\frac{dt}{t}d\mu(y).\end{aligned}$$

At this stage, by an argument used in Case 1) of the proof of Theorem 2.10, we conclude that

$$\mathrm{I}_1\lesssim 2^{-2j(2mM-\theta_1)}\left\{\fint_B|f(x)|^p\,d\mu(x)\right\}^{2/p}.$$

Likewise, for I_2, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I}_2&\le\fint_{S_j(B)}\int_{\frac{d(x,x_B)}{4}}^{\infty}\int_{B(x,t)}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2\,\frac{d\mu(y)}{V(x,t)}\frac{dt}{t}d\mu(x)\\&\lesssim\frac{1}{\mu(2^jB)}\int_{2^{j-1}r_B}^{\infty}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2\,d\mu(y)\frac{dt}{t}\\&\lesssim\frac{1}{\mu(2^jB)}\int_{2^{j-1}r_B}^{\infty}\int_{4B_t}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2\,d\mu(y)\frac{dt}{t}\\&\quad+\sum_{j=2}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\mu(2^jB)}\int_{2^{j-1}r_B}^{\infty}\int_{S_j(B_t)}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(I-e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2\,d\mu(y)\frac{dt}{t}\\&=:\mathrm{K}+\sum_{j=2}^{\infty}\mathrm{H}_j,\end{aligned}$$

where $B_t:=B(x_B,t)$.

Notice that in this situation, $B \subset B_t$ and hence $f = f\chi_{B_t}$. By an argument similar to that used in the proof of Theorem 2.10 and the fact that $(tL)^k e^{-tL} \in \mathcal{O}_m(L^p - L^2)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\{\fint_{4B_t} \left|t^{2m} L e^{-t^{2m}L}(I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2 \, d\mu(y)\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad \lesssim \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \cdots \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \left\{\fint_{4B_t} \left|t^{2m} L^{M+1} e^{-(t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)L} f(y)\right|^2 \, d\mu(y)\right\}^{1/2} d\vec{s} \\
&\quad \lesssim \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \cdots \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \frac{t^{2m}}{(t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)^{M+1}} d\vec{s} \left\{\fint_{4B_t} |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p} \\
&\quad \lesssim \frac{r_B^{2mM}}{t^{2mM}} \left\{\fint_{4B_t} |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $d\vec{s} := ds_1 \cdots ds_M$. This implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{K} &\lesssim \int_{2^{j-1}r_B}^{\infty} \frac{r_B^{4mM}}{t^{4mM}} \frac{\mu(B_t)}{\mu(2^j B)} \frac{dt}{t} \left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{2/p} \\
&\lesssim \int_{2^{j-1}r_B}^{\infty} \frac{r_B^{4mM}}{t^{4mM}} \left(\frac{t}{2^j r_B}\right)^n \frac{dt}{t} \left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{2/p} \\
&\lesssim 2^{-j(4mM-n)} \left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{2/p}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Likewise, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \geq 2$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\{\fint_{S_j(B_t)} \left|t^{2m} L e^{-t^{2m}L}(I - e^{-r_B^{2m}L})^M f(y)\right|^2 \, d\mu(y)\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad \leq \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \cdots \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \left\{\fint_{S_j(B_t)} \left|t^{2m} L^{M+1} e^{-(t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)L} f(y)\right|^2 \, d\mu(y)\right\}^{1/2} d\vec{s} \\
&\quad \lesssim 2^{j\theta_1} \left(\frac{2^j r_{B_t}}{t}\right)^{\theta_2} \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \cdots \int_0^{r_B^{2m}} \frac{t^{2m}}{(t^{2m}+s_1+\cdots+s_M)^{M+1}} \exp\left\{-c\frac{(2^j r_{B_t})^{2m}}{t^{2m}}\right\} d\vec{s} \\
&\qquad \times \left\{\fint_{B_t} |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p} \lesssim 2^{-j(n+\epsilon)} \frac{r_B^{2mM}}{t^{2mM}} \left\{\fint_{B_t} |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{1/p}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{H}_j &\lesssim 2^{-j(n+\epsilon)} \int_{2^{j-1}r_B}^{\infty} \frac{r_B^{4mM}}{t^{4mM}} \frac{\mu(2^j B_t)}{\mu(2^j B)} \left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{2/p} \\
&\lesssim 2^{-j(n+\epsilon)} \int_{2^{j-1}r_B}^{\infty} \frac{r_B^{4mM}}{t^{4mM}} \left(\frac{2^j t}{2^j r_B}\right)^n \frac{dt}{t} \left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{2/p} \\
&\lesssim 2^{-j\epsilon} 2^{-j(4mM-n)} \left\{\fint_B |f(x)|^p \, d\mu(x)\right\}^{2/p},
\end{aligned}
$$

where n is the dimension of $\mathcal{X}$ appearing in (2.2).

From these estimates of K and H_j, we deduce that (2.21) holds and hence S_L is bounded on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ for all $p\in(p_L,\,2)$.

Case 2). $p\in(2,\,q_L)$**.**

In this case, for any $h\in L^{(p/2)'}(\mathcal{X})$, from Fubini's theorem and Hölder's inequality, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}}[S_Lf(x)]^2h(x)\,d\mu(x)&=\int_{\mathcal{X}}\int_0^\infty\int_{B(x,t)}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f(y)\right|^2h(x)\,\frac{d\mu(y)}{V(x,t)}\frac{dt}{t}d\mu(x)\\&=\int_{\mathcal{X}}\int_0^\infty\int_{B(x,t)}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f(y)\right|^2h(x)\,\frac{d\mu(x)}{V(x,t)}\frac{dt}{t}d\mu(y)\\&\lesssim\int_{\mathcal{X}}\int_0^\infty\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f(y)\right|^2\mathcal{M}(h)(y)\,\frac{dt}{t}d\mu(y)\\&\lesssim\int_{\mathcal{X}}[G_Lf(x)]^2\mathcal{M}(h)(y)\,d\mu(y)\lesssim\|G_L(f)\|^2_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}\,\|\mathcal{M}(h)\|_{L^{(p/2)'}(\mathcal{X})}\,.\end{aligned}$$

At this stage, using Theorem 2.10 and the fact that $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ for all $p\in(1,\infty)$, we conclude that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}}[S_Lf(x)]^2h(x)\,d\mu(x)\lesssim\|f\|^2_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}\|h\|_{L^{(p/2)'}(\mathcal{X})},$$

which implies that S_L is bounded on $L^p(\mathcal{X})$ for all $p\in(2,q_L)$ and hence completes the proof of Theorem 2.13. ☐

3 Musielak-Orlicz tent spaces

In this section, we study the Musielak-Orlicz tent space associated with the growth function. We first recall some notions as follows.

For any $\nu\in(0,\infty)$ and $x\in\mathcal{X}$, let $\Gamma_\nu(x):=\{(y,t)\in\mathcal{X}_+:\ d(x,y)<\nu t\}$ be the *cone of aperture* ν *with vertex* $x\in\mathcal{X}$, here and in what follows, we *always assume that* $\mathcal{X}_+:=\mathcal{X}\times(0,\infty)$. For any closed subset F of $\mathcal{X}$, denote by $\mathcal{R}_\nu F$ the *union of all cones with vertices in* F, namely, $\mathcal{R}_\nu F:=\cup_{x\in F}\Gamma_\nu(x)$ and, for any open subset O of $\mathcal{X}$, denote the *tent over* O by $T_\nu(O)$, which is defined as $T_\nu(O):=[\mathcal{R}_\nu(O^\complement)]^\complement$. It is easy to see that $T_\nu(O)=\{(x,t)\in\mathcal{X}_+:\ d(x,O^\complement)\geq\nu t\}$. In what follows, we denote $\Gamma_1(x)$ and $T_1(O)$ *simply by* $\Gamma(x)$ *and* $\widehat{O}$, respectively.

For all measurable functions g on $\mathcal{X}_+$ and $x\in\mathcal{X}$, define

$$\mathcal{A}(g)(x):=\left\{\int_{\Gamma(x)}|g(y,t)|^2\frac{d\mu(y)}{V(x,t)}\frac{dt}{t}\right\}^{1/2}.$$

Coifman, Meyer and Stein [22] introduced the tent space $T^p_2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$ for $p\in(0,\infty)$, here and in what follows, $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+:=\mathbb{R}^n\times(0,\infty)$. The tent space $T^p_2(\mathcal{X}_+)$ on spaces of homogenous type was introduced by Russ [65]. Recall that a measurable function g is said to belong to the *tent space* $T_2^p(\mathcal{X}_+)$ with $p\in(0,\infty)$, if $\|g\|_{T_2^p(\mathcal{X}_+)}:=\|\mathcal{A}(g)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}<\infty$. Moreover, Harboure, Salinas and Viviani [37], and Jiang and Yang [45], respectively, introduced the Orlicz tent spaces $T_\Phi(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$ and $T_\Phi(\mathcal{X}_+)$.

Let φ be as in Definition 2.2. In what follows, we denote by $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$ the *space of all measurable functions g on $\mathcal{X}_+$ such that $\mathcal{A}(g)\in L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$* and, for any $g\in T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$, its *quasi-norm* is defined by

$$\|g\|_{T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)}:=\|\mathcal{A}(g)\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}=\inf\left\{\lambda\in(0,\infty):\ \int_{\mathcal{X}}\varphi\left(x,\frac{\mathcal{A}(g)(x)}{\lambda}\right)d\mu(x)\le 1\right\}.$$

Let $p\in(1,\,\infty)$. A function A on $\mathcal{X}_+$ is called a *$(T_\varphi,\,p)$-atom* if

(i) there exists a ball $B\subset\mathcal{X}$ such that $\operatorname{supp}a\subset\widehat{B}$;

(ii) $\|A\|_{T_2^p(\mathcal{X}_+)}\le[\mu(B)]^{1/p}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}$.

Furthermore, if A is a (T_φ,p)-atom for all $p\in(1,\infty)$, we then call A a *(φ,∞)-atom.*

For functions in $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$, we have the following atomic decomposition.

Theorem 3.1. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2. Then for any $f\in T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$, there exist $\{\lambda_j\}_j\subset\mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $\{A_j\}_j$ of $(T_\varphi,\,\infty)$-atoms associated with $\{B_j\}_j$ such that, for almost every $(x,t)\in\mathcal{X}_+$,*

$$f(x,t)=\sum_j\lambda_jA_j(x,t). \tag{3.1}$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant C such that, for all $f\in T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(\{\lambda_jA_j\}_j)&:=\inf\left\{\lambda\in(0,\infty):\ \sum_j\varphi\left(B_j,\frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right)\le 1\right\}\\&\le C\|f\|_{T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is similar to that of [74, Theorem 3.1]. We omit the details here.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $p\in(0,\infty)$ and φ be as in Definition 2.2. If $f\in T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)\cap T_2^p(\mathcal{X}_+)$, then the decomposition* (3.1) *also holds in both $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$ and $T_2^p(\mathcal{X}_+)$.*

The proof of Corollary 3.2 is similar to that of [74, Corollary 3.5] and hence we omit the details here.

In what follows, let $T_\varphi^b(\mathcal{X}_+)$ and $T_2^{p,\,b}(\mathcal{X}_+)$ with $p\in(0,\infty)$ denote, respectively, the *set of all functions in $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$ and $T_2^p(\mathcal{X}_+)$ with bounded support.* Here and in what follows, a function f on $\mathcal{X}_+$ is said to have *bounded support* means that there exist a ball $B\subset\mathcal{X}$ and $0<c_1<c_2<\infty$ such that $\operatorname{supp}f\subset B\times(c_1,c_2)$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2. Then $T_\varphi^b(\mathcal{X}_+)\subset T_2^{2,\,b}(\mathcal{X}_+)$ as sets.*

The proof of Proposition 3.3 is an application of the uniformly lower type p_2 property of φ for some $p_2\in(0,1]$, which is similar to that of [42, Proposition 3.5]. We omit the details.

4 The Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ and its molecular characterization

In this section, we first introduce the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ associated with the operator L via the Lusin-area function. Then we establish an equivalent characterization of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ in terms of the molecule. We begin with some notions and notations.

Let L satisfy Assumptions (A) and (B), and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be as in (2.9). For all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, the Lusin-area function S_L is defined as in (2.20).

By Theorem 2.13, we know that, for any $p \in (p_L, q_L)$, where p_L and q_L are as in Assumption (B), there exists a positive constant $C(p)$, depending on p, such that, for all $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\|S_L(f)\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})} \le C(p)\|f\|_{L^p(\mathcal{X})}. \tag{4.1}$$

Now we introduce the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ via the Lusin-area function S_L.

Definition 4.1. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2 and L satisfy Assumptions (A) and (B). Assume that p_L and q_L are as in Assumption (B). A function $f \in L^p(\mathcal{X})$ with $p \in (p_L, q_L)$ is said to be in $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ if $S_L(f) \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$ and, moreover, define

$$\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})} := \|S_L f\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})} := \inf\left\{\lambda \in (0,\infty) : \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{S_L(f)(x)}{\lambda}\right)\, d\mu(x) \le 1\right\}.$$

The *Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space* $H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined to be the completion of $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ with respect to the quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})}$.

In what follows, for the simplicity of the notation, we *write* $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) := H_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$.

Remark 4.2. From the Aoki-Rolewicz theorem in [2, 64], it follows that, there exist a quasi-morn $|||\cdot|||$ on $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\gamma \in (0,1]$ such that, for all $f \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$, $|||f||| \sim \|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})}$ and, for any sequence $\{f_j\}_j \subset \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\left|\left|\left|\sum_j f_j\right|\right|\right|^\gamma \le \sum_j |||f_j|||^\gamma.$$

By the theorem of completion of Yosida [75, p. 56], it follows that $(\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X}), |||\cdot|||)$ has a completion space $(H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X}), |||\cdot|||)$; namely, for any $f \in H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$, there exists a Cauchy sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} |||f_k - f||| = 0$. Moreover, if $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$, then there exists a unique $f \in H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} |||f_k - f||| = 0$. Furthermore, by the fact that $|||f||| \sim \|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})}$ for all $f \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})$, we know that the spaces $(H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X}), \|\cdot\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X})})$ and $(H_{\varphi,\,L,\,p}(\mathcal{X}), |||\cdot|||)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.

To introduce the molecular Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space, we first introduce the notion of the molecule associated with the growth function φ.

Definition 4.3. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions (A) and (B), p_L and q_L be as in Assumption (B). Let $q \in (p_L, q_L)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in (0,\infty)$. A function $\alpha \in L^q(\mathcal{X})$ is called a *$(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule* associated with the ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ if, for each $k \in \{0,\,\ldots,\,M\}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, it holds that

$$\left\|\left(r_B^{-2m}L^{-1}\right)^k \alpha\right\|_{L^q(S_j(B))} \le 2^{-j\epsilon}[\mu(2^jB)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Moreover, if α is a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule for all $q \in (p_L,\, q_L)$, then α is called a *$(\varphi,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule.*

Definition 4.4. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions (A) and (B), p_L and q_L be as in Assumption (B). Assume that $q \in (p_L, q_L)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon \in (0,\infty)$. The equality $f = \sum_j \lambda_j\alpha_j$ is called a *molecular $(\varphi,\, r,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)$-representation* of f for some $r \in (p_L, q_L)$, if each α_j is a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule associated to the ball $B_j \subset \mathcal{X}$, the summation converges in $L^r(\mathcal{X})$ and $\{\lambda_j\}_j$ satisfies that

$$\sum_j \varphi\left(B_j, |\lambda_j|\|\chi_{B_j}\|^{-1}_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}\right) < \infty.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) := \{f :\ & f \text{ has a molecular}\\ & (\varphi,\, r,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon) - \text{representation for some } r \in (p_L, q_L)\}\end{aligned}$$

with the *quasi-norm* $\|\cdot\|_{H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})}$ given by setting, for all $f \in \widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|f\|_{H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})}\\ &\quad := \inf\left\{\Lambda(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j) :\ f = \sum_j \lambda_j\alpha_j \text{ is a molecular } (\varphi,\, r,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)\text{-representation}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j)$ is as in (3.2).

The *molecular Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space* $H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ is then defined as the completion of $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ with respect to the quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})}$.

In what follows, let $L^2_b(\mathcal{X}_+)$ denote the *set of all functions $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}_+)$ with bounded support*, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M > \frac{n}{2m}[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} + \frac{\theta_1}{n} - \frac{2}{nq_L}]$, where k, $q(\varphi)$, $i(\varphi)$, θ_1 and q_L are respectively as in Definition 2.7, (2.6), (2.5), (2.10) and Assumption (B). For all $f \in L^2_b(\mathcal{X}_+)$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, define

$$\pi_{L,\,M}(f)(x) := C_{(m,\,M)}\int_0^\infty (t^{2m}L)^{M+1}e^{-t^{2m}L}(f(\cdot,t))(x)\,\frac{dt}{t}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $C_{(m,\,M)}$ is a positive constant such that

$$C_{(m,\,M)}\int_0^\infty t^{2m(M+2)}e^{-2t^{2m}}\,\frac{dt}{t} = 1. \tag{4.3}$$

Here m is as in Definition 2.7.

For the operator $\pi_{L,\,M}$, we have the following boundedness.

Proposition 4.5. *Assume that L satisfies Assumptions* (A) *and* (B), *and $\pi_{L,\,M}$ is as in* (4.2). *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2 with $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(q_L/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$, where q_L and $I(\varphi)$ are, respectively, as in Assumption* (B) *and* (2.4). *Then*

(i) *the operator $\pi_{L,\,M}$, initially defined on the space $T_2^{p,\,b}(\mathcal{X}_+)$ with $p \in (p_L, q_L)$, extends to a bounded linear operator from $T_2^p(\mathcal{X}_+)$ to $L^p(\mathcal{X})$;*

(ii) *the operator $\pi_{L,\,M}$, initially defined on the space $T_\varphi^b(\mathcal{X}_+)$, extends to a bounded linear operator from $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$ to $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. The proof of (i) is similar to that of [46, Proposition 4.1(i)]. We omit the details. Now we prove (ii). Let $f \in T_\varphi^b(\mathcal{X}_+)$. Then by Proposition 3.3, Corollary 3.2 and (i), we know that

$$\pi_{L,\,M} f = \sum_j \lambda_j \pi_{L,\,M} A_j =: \sum_j \lambda_j \alpha_j$$

in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, where $\{\lambda_j\}_j$ and $\{A_j\}_j$ satisfy (3.1) and (3.2). Recall that for each j, $\operatorname{supp} A_j \subset \widehat{B_j}$ and B_j is a ball of $\mathcal{X}$. Moreover, from the fact that S_L is bounded on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, we deduce that for almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $S_L(\pi_{L,\,M}(f))(x) \le \sum_j |\lambda_j| S_L(\alpha_j)(x)$. This, combined with Lemma 2.4(i), yields

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, S_L(\pi_{L,\,M}(f))(x)\right)\, d\mu(x) \lesssim \sum_j \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, |\lambda_j| S_L(\alpha_j)(x)\right)\, d\mu(x).$$

We now claim that for some $\epsilon \in (nq(\varphi)/i(\varphi), \infty)$, $\alpha_j = \pi_{L,\,M}(A_j)$ is a $(\varphi,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule, up to a harmless constant, associated to the ball B_j for each j. Indeed, assume that A is a (T_φ, ∞)-atom associated to the ball $B := B(x_B, r_B)$ and $q \in (p_L, q_L)$. Since for $q \in (p_L, 2)$, each $(\varphi,\, 2,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule is also a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule, to prove the above claim, it suffices to show that $\alpha := \pi_{L,\,M}(A)$ is a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule, up to a harmless constant, adapted to B with $q \in [2, q_L)$.

Let $q \in [2, q_L)$. When $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$, by (i), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_j(B))} &= \|\pi_{L,\,M} A\|_{L^q(S_j(B))} \lesssim \|A\|_{T_2^q(\mathcal{X}_+)} \\ &\lesssim [\mu(B)]^{1/q} \|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1} \sim 2^{-j\epsilon} [\mu(2^j B)]^{1/q} \|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

When $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \ge 5$, take $h \in L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying $\|h\|_{L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})} \le 1$ and $\operatorname{supp} h \subset S_j(B)$. Then from Hölder's inequality and $q' \in (q_L', 2]$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \pi_{L,\,M} A, h\rangle| &\le \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_0^\infty |A(x,t)(t^{2m}L^*)^{M+1} e^{-t^{2m}L^*}(h)(x)| \frac{dt}{t}\, d\mu(x) \\ &\le \|\mathcal{A}(A)\|_{L^q(\mathcal{X})} \left\| \mathcal{A}\left(\chi_{\widehat{B}} (t^{2m}L^*)^{M+1} e^{-t^{2m}L^*}(h)\right) \right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})} \\ &\lesssim \|A\|_{T_2^q(\mathcal{X}_+)} [\mu(B)]^{1/q'-1/2} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \int_{\widehat{B}} \left| (t^{2m}L^*)^{M+1} e^{-t^{2m}L^*}(h)(x,t) \right|^2 \frac{d\mu(x)\, dt}{t} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Moreover, by Assumption (B), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\widehat{B}}\left|(t^{2m}L^*)^{M+1}e^{-t^{2m}L^*}(h)(x,t)\right|^2\,\frac{d\mu(x)\,dt}{t}\\&\lesssim\int_0^{r_B}\left\{2^{j\theta_1}\left[\Upsilon\left(\frac{2^jr_B}{t}\right)\right]^{\theta_2}[\mu(B)]^{1/2}[\mu(2^jB)]^{-1/q'}\exp\left[-\left(\frac{2^jr_B}{t}\right)^{2m/(2m-1)}\right]\right\}^2\frac{dt}{t}\\&\lesssim 2^{2\theta_1j}\mu(B)[\mu(2^jB)]^{-2/q'}\int_0^{r_B}\left(\frac{2^jr_B}{t}\right)^{-2(\epsilon+\theta_1)}\frac{dt}{t}\lesssim 2^{-2\epsilon j}\mu(B)[\mu(2^jB)]^{-2/q'},\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (4.5), implies that

$$|\langle\pi_{L,\,M}a,h\rangle|\lesssim 2^{-\epsilon j}[\mu(B)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}\lesssim 2^{-\epsilon j}[\mu(2^jB)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}.$$

From this and the choice of h, we deduce that, for each $j\in\mathbb{N}$ with $j\ge 5$,

$$\|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_j(B))}=\|\pi_{L,\,M}(a)\|_{L^q(S_j(B))}\lesssim 2^{-\epsilon j}[\mu(2^jB)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}. \tag{4.6}$$

Moreover, let $k\in\{1,\,\dots,\,M\}$. When $j\in\{1,\,\dots,\,4\}$, take $h\in L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying $\|h\|_{L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})}\le 1$ and $\operatorname{supp} h\subset S_j(B)$. Then it follows, from Hölder's inequality and the $L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of $S_{L^*,\,M+1-k}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\langle(r_B^{-2m}L^{-1})^k\pi_{L,\,M}(a),h\rangle|\\&\quad\lesssim\int_0^{r_B}\int_B\left(\frac{t}{r_B}\right)^{2km}|a(x,t)|\left|(t^{2m}L^*)^{M+1-k}e^{-t^{2m}L^*}(h)(x)\right|\frac{d\mu(x)\,dt}{t}\\&\quad\lesssim\|\mathcal{A}(a)\|_{L^q(\mathcal{X})}\,\|S_{L^*,\,M+1-k}(h)\|_{L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})}\\&\quad\lesssim\|a\|_{T_2^q(\mathcal{X}_+)}\lesssim[\mu(B)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}\lesssim 2^{-j\epsilon}[\mu(2^jB)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})},\end{aligned}$$

which implies that, for each $k\in\{1,\,\dots,\,M\}$ and $j\in\{0,\,\dots,\,4\}$,

$$\left\|(r_B^{-2m}L^{-1})^k\alpha\right\|_{L^q(S_j(B))}\lesssim 2^{-j\epsilon}[\mu(2^jB)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}. \tag{4.7}$$

When $j\in\mathbb{N}$ with $j\ge 5$, similar to the proof of (4.5), we know that, for each $m\in\{1,\,\dots,\,M\}$,

$$\left\|\left(r_B^{-2m}L^{-1}\right)^k\alpha\right\|_{L^q(S_j(B))}\lesssim 2^{-\epsilon j}[\mu(2^jB)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})},$$

which, together with (4.4), (4.6) and (4.7), implies that α is a $(\varphi,\,q,\,M,\,\epsilon)_L$-molecule.

Let $\epsilon>nq(\varphi)/i(\varphi)$ and $M\in\mathbb{N}$ with $M>\frac{n}{2m}[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)}+\frac{\theta_1}{n}-\frac{2}{nq_L}]$. By $\varphi\in\mathbb{RH}_{(q_L/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$, $\epsilon>nq(\varphi)/i(\varphi)$ and $M>\frac{n}{2m}[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)}+\frac{\theta_1}{n}-\frac{2}{nq_L}]$, we find that there exist $p_1\in[I(\varphi),1]$, $p_2\in(0,i(\varphi))$, $q_0\in(q(\varphi),\infty)$ and $q\in[2,q_L)$ such that φ is of uniformly upper type p_1 and lower type p_2, $\varphi\in\mathbb{A}_{q_0}(\mathcal{X})$, $\varphi\in\mathbb{RH}_{(q/p_1)'}(\mathcal{X})$, $\epsilon>nq_0/p_2$ and $M>\frac{n}{2m}[\frac{q_0}{p_2}+\frac{\theta_1}{n}-\frac{2}{nq}]$. We now claim that, for any $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi,\,q,\,M,\epsilon)_L$-molecule α associated with the ball $B\subset\mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}}\varphi(x,S_L(\lambda\alpha)(x))\,d\mu(x)\lesssim\varphi\left(B,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right). \tag{4.8}$$

If (4.8) holds, from this, the facts that, for all $\lambda \in (0,\infty)$,

$$S_L(\pi_{L,\,M}(f/\lambda)) = S_L(\pi_{L,\,M}(f))/\lambda \text{ and } \pi_{L,\,M}(f/\lambda) = \sum_j \lambda_j\alpha_j/\lambda,$$

and $S_L(\pi_{L,\,M}(f)) \le \sum_j |\lambda_j| S_L(\alpha_j)$, it follows that, for all $\lambda \in (0,\infty)$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{S_L(\pi_{L,\,M}(f))(x)}{\lambda}\right) d\mu(x) \lesssim \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right),$$

which, together with (3.2), implies that

$$\|\pi_{L,\,M} f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \Lambda(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j) \lesssim \|f\|_{T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)},$$

and hence completes the proof of (ii).

Now we prove (4.8). By the definition of α, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.9)\quad & \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi(x, S_L(\lambda\alpha)(x))\, d\mu(x) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, \left\{\int_0^{r_B}\int_{B(x,t)} \left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}\left(\lambda\alpha\chi_{S_j(B)}\right)(y)\right|^2 \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)t}\right\}^{1/2}\right) dx \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, \left\{\int_{r_B}^\infty\int_{B(x,t)} \left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(r_B^{2m}L)^M\left(\lambda\chi_{S_j(B)}(r_B^{2m}L)^{-M}\alpha\right)(y)\right|^2\right.\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left.\times\frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)t}\right\}^{1/2}\right) dx =: \sum_{j=0}^\infty \mathrm{E}_j + \sum_{j=0}^\infty \mathrm{F}_j.
\end{aligned}$$

For any $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $B_j := 2^j B$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}_j &= \sum_{i=0}^\infty \int_{S_i(B_j)} \varphi\left(x, |\lambda|\left\{\int_0^{r_B}\int_{B(x,t)} \left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}\left(\alpha\chi_{S_j(B)}\right)(y)\right|^2\right.\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left.\times\frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)t}\right\}^{1/2}\right) dx =: \sum_{i=0}^\infty \mathrm{E}_{i,\,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $i \in \{0,\,1,\,\ldots,\,4\}$, by the uniformly upper type p_1 and lower type p_2 properties of φ, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.10)\quad \mathrm{E}_{i,\,j} &\lesssim \|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{p_1} \int_{S_i(B_j)} \varphi\left(x, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}\right)\left[S_L\left(\alpha\chi_{S_j(B)}\right)(x)\right]^{p_1} d\mu(x) \\
&\quad + \|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{p_2} \int_{S_i(B_j)} \varphi\left(x, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}\right)\left[S_L\left(\alpha\chi_{S_j(B)}\right)(x)\right]^{p_2} d\mu(x) \\
&=: \mathrm{G}_{i,\,j} + \mathrm{H}_{i,\,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate $\mathrm{G}_{i,\,j}$. From Hölder's inequality, Theorem 2.13, $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(q/p_1)'}(\mathcal{X})$ and Lemma 2.5(vi), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(4.11)}\qquad \mathrm{G}_{i,\,j} &\lesssim \|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{p_1} \left\{\int_{U_i(B_j)} \left[S_L\left(\alpha\chi_{S_j(B)}\right)(x)\right]^q \,d\mu(x)\right\}^{p_1/q} \\
&\quad \times \left\{\int_{S_i(B_j)} \left[\varphi\left(x, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}\right)\right]^{(q/p_1)'} \,d\mu(x)\right\}^{\frac{1}{(q/p_1)'}} \\
&\lesssim \|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{p_1} \|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_j(B))}^{p_1} [\mu(2^{i+j}B)]^{-p_1/q} \varphi\left(2^{i+j}B, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}\right) \\
&\lesssim 2^{-jp_1[\epsilon - nq_0/p_1]} \varphi\left(B, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For $\mathrm{H}_{i,\,j}$, similarly, we have

$$\mathrm{H}_{i,\,j} \lesssim 2^{-jp_2(\epsilon - nq_0/p_2)} \varphi\left(B, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}\right),$$

which, together with (4.10) and (4.11), implies that, for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $i \in \{0,\,1,\,\ldots,\,4\}$,

$$\text{(4.12)}\qquad \mathrm{E}_{i,\,j} \lesssim 2^{-jp_2(\epsilon - nq_0/p_2)} \varphi\left(B, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}\right).$$

For all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let

$$\mathrm{H}_j(x) := \left\{\int_0^{r_B} \int_{B(x,t)} \left|t^{2m} L e^{-t^{2m}L}\left(\alpha\chi_{S_j(B)}\right)(y)\right|^2 \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)t}\right\}^{1/2}.$$

Now we estimate $\int_{S_i(B_j)} [\mathrm{H}_j(x)]^q \,d\mu(x)$. For any $i,\, j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let

$$\widetilde{S}_i(B_j) := \left\{y \in \mathcal{X} :\ 2^{i-3}2^j r_B \le d(y, r_B) \le 2^{i+1}2^j r_B\right\}.$$

It is easy to see that when $i \ge 5$, $d(S_j(B), S_i(B_j)) \gtrsim 2^{i+j} r_B$. By $M > \frac{n}{2m}(\frac{q_0}{p_2} + \frac{\theta_1}{n} - \frac{2}{nq_L})$, we know that $2mMq + \theta_2 q + q/2 + 1 > (\frac{nq_0}{p_2} + \frac{1}{2} + \theta_1 + \theta_2)q - 1$. Let $s \in ([\frac{nq_0}{p_2} + \frac{1}{2} + \theta_1 + \theta_2]q - 1, 2mMq + \theta_2 q + q/2 + 1)$. Then by Hölder's inequality, Fubini's theorem and Assumption (B), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(4.13)}\qquad &\int_{S_i(B_j)} [\mathrm{H}_j(x)]^q \,d\mu(x) \\
&\le \int_{S_i(B_j)} \left\{\int_0^{r_B} \int_{B(x,t)} \left|t^{2m} L e^{-t^{2m}L}\left(\alpha\chi_{S_j(B)}\right)(y)\right|^q \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)t^{q/2}}\right\} \\
&\quad \times \left\{\int_0^{r_B} \int_{B(x,t)} \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)}\right\}^{(q-2)/2} \,d\mu(x) \\
&\lesssim r_B^{(q-2)/2} \int_0^{r_B} \int_{\widetilde{S}_i(B_j)} \left|t^{2m} L e^{-t^{2m}L}\left(\alpha\chi_{S_j(B)}\right)(y)\right|^q \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{t^{q/2}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim r_B^{(q-2)/2}\int_0^{r_B}\left\{2^{i\theta_1}\left[\Upsilon\left(\frac{2^{i+j}r_B}{t}\right)\right]^{\theta_2}[\mu(2^{i+j}B)]^{1/q}[\mu(2^jB)]^{-1/q}\right.\\
&\quad\left.\times e^{-(\frac{2^{i+j}r_B}{t})^{2m/(2m-1)}}\|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_j(B))}\right\}^q\frac{dt}{t^{q/2}}\\
&\lesssim r_B^{(q-2)/2}2^{i\theta_1 q}2^{-j\epsilon q}(2^{i+j}r_B)^{\theta_2 q}\|\chi_B\|^{-q}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}\mu(2^{i+j}B)\\
&\quad\times\left\{\int_0^{r_B}\left(\frac{t}{2^{i+j}r_B}\right)^s t^{-(\theta_2 q+q/2)}\,dt\right\}\\
&\lesssim 2^{-i[s-(\theta_1+\theta_2)q]}2^{-j(s+\epsilon-\theta_2 q)}\mu(2^{i+j}B)\|\chi_B\|^{-q}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}.
\end{aligned}$$

By using (4.13), similar to the proof of (4.12), we know that for any $j\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $i\in\mathbb{N}$ with $i\geq 5$,

$$\mathrm{E}_{i,\,j}\lesssim 2^{-p_2[s/q-(\theta_1+\theta_2)-nq_0/p_2]i}2^{-p_2(s/q+\epsilon-\theta_2-nq_0/p_2)j}\varphi\left(B,|\lambda|\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}\right). \tag{4.14}$$

Now we deal with F_j. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{F}_j&=\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\int_{S_i(B_j)}\varphi\left(x,|\lambda|\left\{\int_{r_B}^{\infty}\int_{B(x,t)}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(r^{2m}L)^M\left(\chi_{S_j(B)}\right.\right.\right.\right.\\
&\quad\times\left.\left.\left.\left.\left(r_B^{2m}L\right)^{-M}\alpha\right)(y)\right|^2\frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)t}\right\}^{1/2}\right)\,d\mu(x)=:\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathrm{F}_{i,\,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $i\in\{0,\,1,\,\ldots,\,4\}$, similar to the proof of (4.12), we conclude that

$$\mathrm{F}_{i,\,j}\lesssim 2^{-jp_2(\epsilon-nq_0/p_2)}\varphi\left(B,|\lambda|\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}\right). \tag{4.15}$$

For each $j\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ and all $x\in\mathcal{X}$, let

$$\mathrm{G}_j(x):=\left\{\int_{r_B}^{\infty}\int_{B(x,t)}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}\left(r^{2m}L\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_j(B)}\left(r_B^{-2m}L^{-1}\right)^M\alpha\right)(y)\right|^2\frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)t}\right\}^{1/2}.$$

Now we estimate $\int_{S_i(B_j)}[\mathrm{G}_j(x)]^q\,d\mu(x)$. We first see that, for all $x\in\mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{G}_j(x)&\leq\left\{\int_{r_B}^{2^{i+j-3}r_B}\int_{B(x,t)}\left|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}(r^{2m}L)^M\left(\chi_{S_j(B)}\left(r_B^{-2m}L^{-1}\right)^M\alpha\right)(y)\right|^2\right.\\
&\quad\left.\times\frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{V(x,t)t}\right\}^{1/2}+\left\{\int_{2^{i+j-3}r_B}^{\infty}\cdots\right\}^{1/2}=:\mathrm{G}_{j,\,1}(x)+\mathrm{G}_{j,\,2}(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

For $\mathrm{G}_{j,\,1}$, similar to (4.13), we conclude that, when $i\in\mathbb{N}$ with $i\geq 5$,

$$\int_{S_i(B_j)}[\mathrm{G}_{j,\,1}(x)]^q\,d\mu(x)\lesssim 2^{-i[s+1-(\theta_1+\theta_2+1/2)q]} \tag{4.17}$$

$$\times 2^{-j[s+1+\epsilon-(\theta_2+1/2)q]}\mu(2^{i+j}B)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-q}.$$

For $\mathrm{G}_{j,\,2}$, by Theorem 2.13, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{S_i(B_j)}[\mathrm{G}_{j,\,2}(x)]^q\,d\mu(x) &\lesssim \frac{r_B^{2mMq}}{(2^{i+j}r_B)^{2mMq}}\int_{S_i(B_j)}\left[S_{L,\,M+1}\left(\chi_{S_j(B)}(r_B^{2m}L)^{-M}\alpha\right)(x)\right]^q\,d\mu(x)\\ &\lesssim 2^{-2mMq(i+j)}\left\|(r_B^{2m}L)^{-M}\alpha\right\|_{L^q(S_j(B))}^q\\ &\lesssim 2^{-2mMqi}2^{-j(2mMq+\epsilon q)j}\mu(2^jB)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-q},\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (4.16) and (4.17), implies that

$$\int_{S_i(B_j)}[\mathrm{G}_j(x)]^q\,d\mu(x)\lesssim 2^{-i[s+1-(\theta_1+\theta_2+1/2)q]}2^{-j[s+1+\epsilon-(\theta_2+1/2)q]}\mu(2^{i+j}B)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-q}.$$

By using this estimate, similar to the proof of (4.14), we see that, for all $j\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $i\in\mathbb{N}$ with $i\geq 5$,

$$\mathrm{F}_{i,\,j}\lesssim 2^{p_2[(s+1)/q-(\theta_1+\theta_2+1/2)-nq_0/p_2]}2^{p_2[(s+1)/q+\epsilon-(\theta_1+1/2)-nq_0/p_2]}\varphi\left(B,|\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1}\right),$$

which, together with (4.9) through (4.15) and $s>[\frac{nq_0}{p_2}+\frac{1}{2}+\theta_1+\theta_2]q-1$, implies that (4.8) holds true, and hence completes the proof of Proposition 4.5. ☐

Proposition 4.6. *Let* φ *be as in Definition 2.2,* L *satisfy Assumptions* (A) *and* (B), $\epsilon\in(nq(\varphi)/i(\varphi),\infty)$ *and* $M\in\mathbb{N}$ *with* $M>\frac{n}{2m}[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)}+\frac{\theta_1}{n}-\frac{2}{nq_L}]$*. Then, for all* $f\in H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})\cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$*, there exist* $\{\lambda_j\}_j\subset\mathbb{C}$ *and a sequence* $\{\alpha_j\}_j$ *of* $(\varphi,\,M,\,\epsilon)_L$*-molecules, respectively, associated with the balls* $\{B_j\}_j$ *such that* $f=\sum_j\lambda_j\alpha_j$ *in both* $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $L^2(\mathcal{X})$*. Moreover, there exists a positive constant* C *such that, for all* $f\in H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})\cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$*,*

$$\Lambda(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j):=\inf\left\{\lambda\in(0,\infty):\ \sum_j\varphi\left(B_j,\frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right)\leq 1\right\}\leq C\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

Proof. Let $f\in H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})\cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Then by the H_∞-functional calculi for L and (4.1), we know that

$$f=C_{(m,\,M)}\int_0^\infty(t^{2m}L)^{M+2}e^{-2t^{2m}L}f\frac{dt}{t}=\pi_{L,\,M}\left(t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f\right)$$

in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, from Definition 4.1 and the $L^2(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of S_L, we infer that $t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f\in T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)\cap T_2^2(\mathcal{X}_+)$. Applying Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.2 and Proposition 4.5 to $t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f$, we conclude that

$$f=\pi_{L,\,M}(t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f)=\sum_j\lambda_j\pi_{L,\,M}A_j=:\sum_j\lambda_j\alpha_j$$

in $L^2(\mathcal{X})\cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$, and $\Lambda(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j)\lesssim\|t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f\|_{T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)}\sim\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})}$. Furthermore, by the proof of Proposition 4.5, we know that, for each j, α_j is a $(\varphi,\,M,\,\epsilon)_L$-molecule up to a harmless constant, which completes the proof of Proposition 4.6. ☐

The proofs of Propositions 4.5 and 4.6 imply immediately the following corollary.

Corollary 4.7. *Let* φ *be as in Definition 2.2,* L *satisfy Assumptions* (A) *and* (B), p_L *and* q_L *be as in Assumption* (B), $q \in (p_L, q_L)$ *and* $M \in \mathbb{N}$ *satisfying* $M > \frac{n}{2m}[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} + \frac{\theta_1}{n} - \frac{2}{nq}]$, *where* $q(\varphi)$, $i(\varphi)$ *and* θ_1 *are respectively as in* (2.6), (2.5) *and* (2.10). *Suppose that* T *is a linear (resp. nonnegative sublinear) operator which maps* $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ *continuously into weak* $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. *If there exists a positive constant* C *such that, for all* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ *and* $(\varphi, q, M, \epsilon)_L$*-molecule* α *associated with the ball* B,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, T(\lambda\alpha)(x)\right) d\mu(x) \le C\varphi\left(B, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right),$$

then T *can extend to be a bounded linear (resp. sublinear) operator from* $H^{M,q,\epsilon}_{\varphi,L}(\mathcal{X})$ *to* $L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$.

Theorem 4.8. *Let* φ *be as in Definition 2.2 and* L *satisfy Assumptions* (A) *and* (B). *Assume that* $q \in [2, q_L) \cap ([r(\varphi)]' I(\varphi), q_L)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ *with* $M > \frac{n}{2m}[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} + \frac{\theta_1}{n} - \frac{2}{nq}]$, $\epsilon \in (nq(\varphi)/i(\varphi), \infty)$, *where* q_L, $r(\varphi)$, $I(\varphi)$, $q(\varphi)$ *and* $i(\varphi)$ *are, respectively, as in Assumption (B),* (2.7), (2.4), (2.6) *and* (2.5). *Then* $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $H^{M,q,\epsilon}_{\varphi,L}(\mathcal{X})$ *coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

Proof. We first prove that

$$\widetilde{H}^{M,q,\epsilon}_{\varphi,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X}) \subset \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,L,2}(\mathcal{X})$$

and the inclusion is continuous. Let $f \in \widetilde{H}^{M,q,\epsilon}_{\varphi,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Then there exist $\{\lambda_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $\{\alpha_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $(\varphi, q, M, \epsilon)_L$-molecules such that $f = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda_j\alpha_j$, where the summation converges in $L^r(\mathcal{X})$ for some $r \in (p_L, q_L)$. By Theorem 2.13, we see that, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $S_L(\sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_j\alpha_j - f)(x) \le \sum_{j=i+1}^\infty |\lambda_j| S_L(\alpha_j)(x)$ for almost every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, which, together with (4.8) and $f \in H^{M,q,\epsilon}_{\varphi,L}(\mathcal{X})$, implies that

$$S_L\left(\sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_j\alpha_j - f\right) \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{X}) \tag{4.18}$$

and

$$\left\|S_L\left(\sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_j\alpha_j - f\right)\right\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})} \to 0$$

as $i \to \infty$. Moreover, by the definition of $(\varphi, q, M, \epsilon)_L$-molecules, Hölder's inequality and $q \ge 2$, we conclude that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_j \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, which, together with $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, implies that, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $f - \sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_j\alpha_j \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$. From this and (4.18), it follows that $f \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,L,2}(\mathcal{X})$. Furthermore, by the fact that $S_L(f) \le \sum_{j=1}^\infty |\lambda_j| S_L(\alpha_j)$ and (4.8), we see that

$$\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,L}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{M,q,\epsilon}_{\varphi,L}(\mathcal{X})}. \tag{4.19}$$

Now we prove that $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and the inclusion is continuous. Let $f \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$. Then by Proposition 4.6, we know that there exist $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $\{\alpha_j\}_j$ of $(\varphi,\,q,\,M,\,\epsilon)_L$-molecules such that $f = \sum_j \lambda_j\alpha_j$ in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and $\Lambda(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j) \lesssim \|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})}$, which implies that $f \in \widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\|f\|_{H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

From this and (4.19), we infer that $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X}) = \widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and, for all $f \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})} \sim \|f\|_{H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})}.$$

To finish the proof of Theorem 4.8, it suffices to prove that $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ are dense in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$, respectively. Indeed, if these hold true, by these and a standard density argument, we conclude that $H_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ coincide with equivalent norms. Obviously, $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$. Now we prove that $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $f \in \widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$. Then there exist a sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $\{\alpha_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $(\varphi,\,q,\,M,\,\epsilon)_L$-molecules such that $f = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \lambda_j\alpha_j$ in $L^r(\mathcal{X})$ with some $r \in (p_L, q_L)$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_N := \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j\alpha_j$. From the definition of $(\varphi,\,q,\,M,\,\epsilon)$-molecules, $q \geq 2$ and Hölder's inequality, we deduce that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_j \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, which implies that, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_N \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Thus, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_N \in \widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$, and $\|f - f_N\|_{H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. By this, we see that $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ and hence dense in $H^{M,\,q,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.8. □

Theorem 4.9. *Let* φ *be as in Definition 2.2 and* L *satisfy Assumptions* (A) *and* (B). *Assume that* $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(q_L/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$. *Then the spaces* $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ *and* $H_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X})$, *with* $s \in (p_L, q_L)$, *coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

Proof. Let $s \in (p_L, q_L)$. By the definitions of the spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ and $H_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X})$, we see that $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ coincide with equivalent norms. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.8, we need to prove that $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ are dense in $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X})$, respectively.

We first prove that $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^s(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$. Let $f \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$. Then by Proposition 4.5, we know that there exist $\{\lambda_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $\{\alpha_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $(\varphi,\,q,\,M,\,\epsilon)_L$-molecules, with $q \in (\max\{s,\,2\}, q_L)$, such that $f = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda_j\alpha_j$ in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$. From $q \in (s, q_L) \cap [2, \infty)$ and Hölder's inequality, we deduce that, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, α_j is a $(\varphi,\,2,\,M,\,\epsilon)_L$-molecule and also a $(\varphi,\,s,\,M,\,\epsilon)_L$-molecule, which implies that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j\alpha_j \in L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^s(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, by (4.8), we see that $S_L(\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j\alpha_j) \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$. Thus, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j\alpha_j \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^s(\mathcal{X})$. Furthermore, from $f = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda_j\alpha_j$ in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$, we infer that $\|f - \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j\alpha_j\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. Thus, $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^s(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$.

Let $f \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X})$. By the definition of $H_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X})$, we see that $t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f \in T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_N := \pi_{L,\,M}(t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f\chi_{O_N})$, where

$$O_N := \{(y,t) \in \mathcal{X} \times (0,\infty) : \ d(y,x_0) < N, \ t \in (N^{-1}, N)\}$$

with some $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Then from Proposition 3.3, we infer that $t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f\chi_{O_N} \in T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+) \cap T_2^2(\mathcal{X}_+)$, which implies that $f_N \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, by $f \in L^s(\mathcal{X})$ and the $L^s(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of S_L, we conclude that $S_L(f) \in L^s(\mathcal{X})$, which implies that $t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f \in T_2^s(\mathcal{X}_+)$. From this and the definition of $T_2^s(\mathcal{X}_+)$, it follows that $t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f\chi_{O_N} \in T_2^{s,\,b}(\mathcal{X}_+)$, which, together with proposition 4.5(i), implies that $f_N \in L^s(\mathcal{X})$. Thus, $f_N \in \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,2}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^s(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover,

$$\|S_L(f_N - f)\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \left\| t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}f\chi_{(O_N)^\complement} \right\|_{T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)} \to 0,$$

as $N \to \infty$. Thus, $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L,\,s}(\mathcal{X})$, which completes the proof of Theorem 4.9. ☐

As a corollary of Theorem 4.9, we have the following conclusion. We omit the details.

Corollary 4.10. *Let L satisfy Assumptions* (A) *and* (B), *and φ be as in Definition 2.2 with $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(q_L/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$, where q_L and $I(\varphi)$ are respectively as in Assumption* (B) *and* (2.4). *Then, for all $s \in (p_L, q_L)$, the space $L^s(\mathcal{X}) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$.*

5 The atomic characterization of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$

In this section, we establish the atomic characterization of the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$. To obtain the support condition of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ atoms by using the finite propagation speed for the wave equation, we have to restrict to a special case of operators satisfying Assumptions (A) and (B). More precisely, throughout this section, we assume that the considered operator L satisfies the following assumptions as in [12]:

Assumption (H_1)**.** L is a non-negative and self-adjoint operator in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$.

Assumption (H_2)**.** There exists a constant $p_L \in [1,2)$ such that the semigroup $\{e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$, generated by L, satisfies the reinforced (p_L, p_L', 1) off-diagonal estimates on balls as in Assumption (B).

Remark 5.1. (i) It is easy to see that if an operator L satisfying Assumptions (H_1) and (H_2) is one-to-one, then it falls in the scope of operators satisfying Assumptions (A) and (B). For the more general case, by using the functional calculus via the spectral theorem, all the results obtained in the above sections still hold true in this situation. Here, the Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined as in Definition 4.1. This is a little different from the version of Hofmann et al. in [39], where the dense subspace $H^2(\mathcal{X})$ of the Hardy space is defined to be the completion of the *range* of L in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, $\overline{\mathcal{R}(L)}$ (see [39] for more details). Recall that $L^2(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{N}(L) \bigoplus \overline{\mathcal{R}(L)}$, where $\mathcal{N}(L)$ denotes the *kernel* of L. We know that these Hardy spaces are different from a kernel space $\mathcal{N}(L)$, which is not essential for our purpose. We make this change in the definition of the Hardy space, because it brings us some conveniences; for example, when $p = 2$, we obtain $H^p_L(\mathcal{X}) = L^2(\mathcal{X})$.

(ii) The following definition of the L^q off-diagonal estimates is from [4]. For all $q \in (1, \infty)$, a family $\{T_t\}_{t>0}$ of operators is said to satisfy the L^q *off-diagonal estimates*, if there exist two positive constants C and c such that

$$\|e^{-tL}f\|_{L^q(F)} \le Ce^{-\frac{[d(E,F)]^2}{ct}}\|f\|_{L^q(E)}$$

holds true for every closed sets E, $F \subset \mathcal{X}$, $t \in (0,\infty)$ and $f \in L^q(E)$. From [7], we deduce that $\{T_t\}_{t>0} \in \mathcal{O}_1(L^q - L^q)$ if and only if $\{T_t\}_{t>0}$ satisfies the L^q off-diagonal estimates. Thus, Assumption (H$_2$) implies that $\{T_t\}_{t>0}$ satisfies the L^q off-diagonal estimates.

To establish the atomic characterization of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$, we first introduce the notion of the following atoms.

Definition 5.2. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions (H$_1$) and (H$_2$), and p_L be as in Assumption (H$_2$). Assume that $q \in (p_L, p'_L)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ is a ball. A function $a \in L^q(\mathcal{X})$ is called a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$*-atom* associated with B, if there exists a function $b \in \mathcal{D}(L^M)$ such that

(i) $a = L^M b$;

(ii) for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, M\}$, $\operatorname{supp}(L^k b) \subset B$;

(iii) $\|(r_B^2 L)^k b\|_{L^q(\mathcal{X})} \le r_B^{2M}[\mu(B)]^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}$, where r_B is the radius of B and $k \in \{0, \ldots, M\}$.

Moreover, if a is a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-atom for all $q \in (p_L, p'_L)$, then a is called a $(\varphi,\, M)_L$*-atom*.

Based on this kind of atoms, we introduce the following atomic Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space.

Definition 5.3. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions (H$_1$) and (H$_2$), and p_L be as in Assumption (H$_2$). Assume that $q \in (p_L,\, p'_L)$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$. For $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, $f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j$ is called an *atomic* $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$*-representation* of f, if, for all j, a_j is a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-atom associated with the ball $B_j \subset \mathcal{X}$, the summation converges in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ satisfies that

$$\sum_j \varphi\left(B_j,\, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right) < \infty.$$

Let

$$\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X}) := \{f :\ f \text{ has an atomic } (\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L\text{-representation}\}$$

with the *quasi-norm* given by

$$\|f\|_{H^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})}$$

$$:= \inf \left\{ \Lambda(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j) : \; f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j \text{ is an atomic } (\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L\text{-representation} \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all the atomic $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-representations of f and

$$\Lambda\left(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j\right) := \inf \left\{ \lambda \in (0,\, \infty) : \; \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j,\, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda \|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right) \le 1 \right\}.$$

The *atomic Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space* $H^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ is then defined as the completion of $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ with respect to the *quasi-norm* $\|\cdot\|_{H^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})}$.

We have the following atomic characterization of the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$.

Theorem 5.4. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions* (H_1) *and* (H_2)*, p_L be as in Assumption* (H_2) *and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - \frac{1}{p'_L})$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are respectively as in* (2.6) *and* (2.5)*. Assume further that $q \in ([r(\varphi)]'I(\varphi), p'_L) \cap (p_L, p'_L)$, where $r(\varphi)$ and $I(\varphi)$ are, respectively, as in* (2.7) *and* (2.4)*. Then, $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

Remark 5.5. When $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{R}^n$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in [0, \infty)$, $\varphi(x, t) := t^p w(x)$ with $p \in (0, 1]$ and w a Muckenhoupt weight, Theorem 5.4 is just [12, Theorem 3.8].

To prove Theorem 5.4, we need to introduce some operator $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}$, which can be viewed as a retraction operator from the Musielak-Orlicz-tent space $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$, introduced in Section 3, to $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$. To this end, we first give some notations. In what follows, for any operator T, we let K_T be its *integral kernel*. Let $cos(t\sqrt{L})$ with $t \in (0,\, \infty)$ be the *cosine function operator* generated by L. By [24, Theorem 3.4] (see also [39, Proposition 3.4]), we know that there exists a positive constant C_0 such that

$$\operatorname{supp} K_{cos(t\sqrt{L})} \subset \{(x,\, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} : \; d(x,\, y) \le C_0 t\}. \tag{5.1}$$

Moreover, let $\psi \in \mathrm{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R})$ be even and $\operatorname{supp} \psi \subset (-C_0^{-1}, C_0^{-1})$, where C_0 is as in (5.1). Let Φ denote the *Fourier transform* of ψ. Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$, the kernel of $(t^2 L)^k \Phi(t\sqrt{L})$ satisfies that

$$\operatorname{supp} K_{(t^2L)^k\Phi(t\sqrt{L})} \subset \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} : \; d(x,\, y) \le t\}. \tag{5.2}$$

Now, let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - \frac{1}{p'_L})$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are respectively as in (2.6) and (2.5). Assume that Φ is as in (5.2). Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $f \in L^2_b(\mathcal{X}_+)$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the *operator* $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}$ is defined by

$$\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}(f)(x) := C_{(\Phi,\,k)} \int_0^\infty \left(t^2 L\right)^{k+1} \Phi(t\sqrt{L})(f(\cdot,\, t))(x)\, \frac{dt}{t},$$

where $C_{(\Phi,\,k)}$ is a positive constant such that

$$C_{(\Phi,\,k)}\int_0^\infty t^{2(k+1)}\Phi(t)t^2e^{-t^2}\,\frac{dt}{t}=1. \tag{5.3}$$

Using Minkowski's integral inequality and the quadratic estimates (see also [39, (3.14)]), we easily see that $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}$ can be continuously extended from $T^2(\mathcal{X}_+)$ to $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, we have the following boundedness of $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}$, which can be viewed as an extension of [74, Proposition 4.6].

Proposition 5.6. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions* (H$_1$) *and* (H$_2$), *p_L be as in Assumption* (H$_2$), *$q\in(p_L,p_L')$ and $M\in\mathbb{N}$ satisfying $M>\frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)}-\frac{1}{p_L'})$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are respectively as in* (2.6) *and* (2.5). *Assume further that $\varphi\in\mathbb{RH}_{(p_L'/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$, where $I(\varphi)$ is as in* (2.4). *Then the operator $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}$, initially defined on the space $T^b_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$, extends to a bounded linear operator from $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$ to $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may only prove Proposition 5.6 under the assumption that $q\in[2,\,p_L')$. For the case when $q\in(p_L,\,2)$, the following proof is still valid, only need to make a few modifications when using Hölder's inequality. Let $f\in T^b_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$. From Proposition 3.3, Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.2 and the fact that $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}$ is bounded from $T^2_2(\mathcal{X}_+)$ to $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, we deduce that there exist a family $\{A_j\}_j$ of $(T_\varphi,\,\infty)$-atoms associated respectively to the balls $\{B_j\}_j$ and $\{\lambda_j\}_j\subset\mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}(f)=\sum_j\lambda_j\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}(A_j)=:\sum_j\lambda_j a_j$$

in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ and

$$\Lambda(\{\lambda_jA_j\}_j)\lesssim\|f\|_{T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)}, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\Lambda(\{\lambda_jA_j\}_j)$ is as in (3.2). Moreover, since the square function S_L is nonnegative (which means that, for all $f\in\mathcal{D}(S_L)$ and $x\in\mathcal{X}$, $S_L(f)(x)\geq0$), sublinear and S_L is bounded on $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, we know that, for almost every $x\in\mathcal{X}$, $S_L(\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}(f))(x)\leq\sum_j\lambda_jS_L(a_j)(x)$. This, combined with Lemma 2.4(i), implies that, for all $\lambda\in(0,\infty)$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}}\varphi\left(x,\,\frac{S_L(\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}(f))(x)}{\lambda}\right)d\mu(x)\lesssim\sum_j\int_{\mathcal{X}}\varphi\left(x,\,|\lambda_j|S_L(\lambda_ja_j(x)/\lambda)\right)d\mu(x). \tag{5.5}$$

We first prove that, for each j, a_j is a $(\varphi,\,M)_L$-atom associated with B_j. Indeed, let

$$b_j:=C_{(\Phi,\,M)}\int_0^\infty t^{2(M+1)}L\Phi(t\sqrt{L})(A_j(\cdot,\,t))\,\frac{dt}{t}, \tag{5.6}$$

where $C_{(\Phi,\,M)}$ is as in (5.3). From (5.2), we infer that, for all $k\in\{0,\,\dots,\,M\}$, $\operatorname{supp}L^kb_j\subset B_j$, which is the support condition of a $(\varphi,\,q,\,M)_L$-atom as in Definition 5.2.

On the other hand, for any $h \in L^{q'}(B_j) \cap L^2(B_j)$, By (5.6), Assumption (H$_1$), Fubini's theorem, the fact that $\operatorname{supp} A_j \subset \widehat{B}_j$ and Hölder's inequality, we conclude that, for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, M\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(r_{B_j}^2 L\right)^k b_j(x) h(x)\, d\mu(x)\right| \\
&\quad\sim \left|\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathcal{X}} A_j(x, t) \left(r_{B_j}^2 L\right)^k t^{2(M+1)} L\Phi(t\sqrt{L}) h(x) \frac{d\mu(x)\, dt}{t}\right| \\
&\quad\lesssim r_{B_j}^{2M} \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left|A_j(x, t) \left(t^2 L\right)^{k+1} \Phi(t\sqrt{L}) h(x)\right| \frac{d\mu(x)\, dt}{t} \\
&\quad\lesssim r_{B_j}^{2M} \|\mathcal{A}(A_j)\|_{L^q(\mathcal{X})} \left\|\left[\int_{\Gamma(x)} \left|\left(t^2 L\right)^{k+1} \Phi(t\sqrt{L}) h(x)\right|^2 \frac{d\mu(x)\, dt}{V(x,t)t}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_{L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Following the same argument as that used in the proof of [12, Lemma 5.3], we easily see that, for all $q' \in (p_L, p_L')$, $\pi_{\Phi, L, k}$ is bounded on $L^{q'}(\mathcal{X})$. This, together with the arbitrariness of h and the fact that A_j is a (T_φ, ∞)-atom associated with B_j, implies that

$$\left\|\left(r_{B_j}^2 L\right)^k b_j\right\|_{L^q(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim r_{B_j}^{2M} [\mu(B)]^{1/q} \|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-1},$$

which is the size condition of a $(\varphi, q, M)_L$-atom as in Definition 5.2(iii). Thus, we conclude that, for each j, a_j is a $(\varphi, M)_L$-atom associated with B_j.

We claim that, to finish the proof of Proposition 5.6, it suffices to show that, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi, M)_L$-atom a associated with the ball $B \subset \mathcal{X}$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, S_L(\lambda a)(x)\right) d\mu(x) \lesssim \varphi\left(B, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right). \tag{5.7}$$

Indeed, if (5.7) holds, then by (5.5), we see immediately that, for all $f \in T_\varphi^b(\mathcal{X}_+)$ and $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{S_L(\pi_{\Phi, L, M}(f))(x)}{\lambda}\right) d\mu(x) \lesssim \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right),$$

which, together with (5.4), implies that $\|\pi_{\Phi, L, M} f\| \lesssim \Lambda\left(\{\lambda_j A_j\}_j\right) \lesssim \|f\|_{T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)}$. Thus, $\pi_{\Phi, L, M}$ can be extended to a bounded operator from $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$ to $H_{\varphi, L}(\mathcal{X})$. This proves the claim. By $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - \frac{1}{p_L'})$, $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(p_L'/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$ and Lemma 2.5(iv), we know that there exist $q_0 \in (q(\varphi), \infty)$, $p_2 \in (0, i(\varphi))$, $p_1 \in [I(\varphi), 1]$ and $q \in (I(\varphi)[r(\varphi)]', p_L') \cap (p_L, p_L')$ such that φ is of uniformly upper type p_1 and lower type p_2, $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{q_0}(\mathcal{X})$, $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q_0}{p_2} - \frac{1}{q})$ and

$$\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(q/p_1)'}(\mathcal{X}). \tag{5.8}$$

Now, for $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$, similar to the proof of (4.12), we conclude that

$$\int_{S_j(B)} \varphi\left(x, S_L(\lambda a)(x)\right) d\mu(x) \lesssim \varphi\left(B, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right).$$

Now, we turn to the case when $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \geq 5$. From the fact that φ is of uniformly upper type p_1 and lower type p_2, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{S_j(B)} \varphi\left(x,\, S_L(\lambda a)(x)\right)\, d\mu(x) \\
&\quad \lesssim \int_{S_j(B)} \left[S_L(a)(x)\|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}\right]^{p_1} \varphi\left(x,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}}\right) d\mu(x) \\
&\qquad + \int_{S_j(B)} \left[S_L(a)(x)\|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}\right]^{p_2} \varphi\left(x,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}}\right) d\mu(x) =: \mathrm{I}_j + \mathrm{J}_j.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate I_j, let $\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_j := \|S_L(a)\|^q_{L^q(S_j(B))}$. By Hölder's inequality and (5.8), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}_j &\lesssim \|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})} \|S_L(a)\|^{p_1}_{L^q(S_j(B))} \left\{\int_{S_j(B)} \left[\varphi\left(x,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}}\right)\right]^{(\frac{q}{p_1})'} d\mu(x)\right\}^{\frac{1}{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}} \\
&\lesssim \left[\mu(2^jB)\right]^{-\frac{p_1}{q}} \|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})} \widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_j^{\frac{p_1}{q}} \varphi\left(S_j(B),\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{X})}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

To estimate $\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_j$, we write $\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_j$ into

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_j &\lesssim \int_{S_j(B)} \left[\int_0^{\frac{d(x,\,x_B)}{4}} \int_{B(x,t)} \left|t^2Le^{-t^2L}(a)(y)\right|^2 \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{t\,V(x,t)}\right]^{\frac{q}{2}} d\mu(x) \\
&\quad + \int_{S_j(B)} \left[\int_{\frac{d(x,\,x_B)}{4}}^{\infty} \int_{B(x,t)} \cdots \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{t\,V(x,t)}\right]^{\frac{q}{2}} d\mu(x) =: \mathcal{A}_j + \mathcal{B}_j.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

We first estimate $\mathcal{A}_j$. For $j \geq 5$, let

$$G_j(B) := \left\{y \in \mathcal{X} :\ \text{there exists } x \in S_j(B) \text{ such that } d(y,x) < \frac{1}{4}d(x,x_B)\right\},$$

where x_B denotes the center of B. Moreover, by the triangle inequality, we easily see that, for all $y \in G_j(B)$, $d(y,x_B) \leq 2^{k+1}r_B$ and $d(y,x_B) \geq 2^{k-2}r_B$. Thus, $G_j(B) \subset \cup_{i=j-1}^{i+1} S_i(B) =: \widetilde{\widetilde{S}}_j(B)$. This, combining with Hölder's inequality, Fubini's theorem, the definition of the function b as in (5.6), Assumption (H_2) and the fact that a is a $(\varphi,\, M)_L$-atom, implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_j &\lesssim (2^jr_B)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} \int_{S_j(B)} \left[\int_0^{\frac{d(x,\,x_B)}{4}} \int_{B(x,t)} \left|t^2Le^{-t^2L}(a)(y)\right|^q \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{t^{\frac{q}{2}}\,V(x,t)}\right] d\mu(x) \\
&\lesssim (2^jr_B)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} \int_0^{2^{j-2}r_B} \int_{\widetilde{\widetilde{S}}_j(B)} \left|\left(t^2L\right)^{M+1} e^{-t^2L}(b)(y)\right|^q \frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{t^{q(\frac{1}{2}+2M)}} \\
&\lesssim (2^jr_B)^{\frac{q}{2}-1} \|b\|^q_{L^q(B)} \int_0^{2^{j-2}r_B} \exp\left\{-C\frac{[2^jr_B]^2}{t^2}\right\} \frac{dt}{t^{q(\frac{1}{2}+2M)}}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-2jqM}\mu(B)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-q}.$$

The estimate of $\mathcal{B}_j$ is similar to that of $\mathcal{A}_j$ and, via replacing Assumption (H_2) by the $L^q(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of the family of operators $\{(t^2L)^M e^{-t^2L}\}_{t>0}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_j &\lesssim (2^j r_B)^{-4M(\frac{q}{2}-1)}\int_{S_j(B)}\left[\int_{\frac{d(x,x_B)}{4}}^\infty\int_{B(x,t)}\left|t^2Le^{-t^2L}(b)(y)\right|^q\frac{d\mu(y)\,dt}{t^{4M+1}V(x,t)}\right]d\mu(x)\\ &\lesssim (2^j r_B)^{-4M(\frac{q}{2}-1)}\|b\|_{L^q(\mathcal{X})}^q\int_{2^{j-3}r_B}^\infty\frac{dt}{t^{4M+1}}\lesssim 2^{-2jqM}\mu(B)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-q},\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5.10) and (5.11), shows immediately that

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_j\lesssim 2^{-2jqM}\mu(B)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}^{-q}.$$

Thus, from this, (5.9) and Lemma 2.5(vii), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I}_j &\lesssim 2^{-2jp_1M}\left[\mu(2^jB)\right]^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}\mu(B)\varphi\left(S_j(B),\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right)\\ &\lesssim 2^{-j[2p_1M-n(q_0-\frac{p_1}{q})]}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)}}\right)\sim 2^{-j\epsilon_0}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)}}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{5.12}$$

where $\epsilon_0 := 2p_1M - n(q_0 - p_1/q)$. The estimate of J_j is similar to that of I_j. We only need to point out that, from Lemma 2.5(ii) and the fact that $(\frac{q}{p_2})' < (\frac{q}{p_1})'$, it follows that $\varphi\in\mathbb{RH}_{(\frac{q}{p_2})'}(\mathcal{X})$. Thus, we conclude that

$$\mathrm{J}_j\lesssim 2^{-j[2p_2M-n(q_0-\frac{p_2}{q})]}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right)\sim 2^{-j\widetilde{\epsilon}_0}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right),\tag{5.13}$$

where $\widetilde{\epsilon}_0 := 2p_2M - n(q_0 - p_2/q)$. Let $\widetilde{\widetilde{\epsilon}}_0 := \min\{\epsilon_0,\,\widetilde{\epsilon}_0\} > 0$. Combining (5.12) and (5.13), we immediately conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\varphi\left(x,\,S_L(\lambda a)(x)\right)d\mu(x) &\lesssim \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}}2^{-j\widetilde{\widetilde{\epsilon}}_0}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right)\\ &\lesssim\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{5.14}$$

which completes the proof of (5.7) and hence Proposition 5.6. □

Before turning to the proof of Theorem 5.4, we introduce a sufficient condition which guarantees a given operator to be bounded on the atomic Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space.

Lemma 5.7. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions* (H_1) *and* (H_2), *p_L be as in Assumption* (H_2), *$q\in(p_L,p_L')$ and $M\in\mathbb{N}$ satisfying $M>\frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)}-\frac{1}{p_L'})$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are respectively as in* (2.6) *and* (2.5). *Suppose that T is a linear (resp. nonnegative sublinear) operator which maps $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ continuously into weak-$L^2(\mathcal{X})$. If there exists a* *positive constant C such that, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-atom a associated with the ball B,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x,\, T(\lambda a)(x)\right)\, d\mu(x) \le C\varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right), \tag{5.15}$$

then T can extend to be a bounded linear (resp. sublinear) operator from $H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ to $L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$.

The proof of Lemma 5.7 is similar to that of [74, Lemma 5.6]. See also the proof of [46, Lemma 5.1] and [12, Lemma 4.1]. We omit the details here.

Now we prove Theorem 5.4 by using Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 5.7.

Proof of Theorem 5.4. By Definition 5.3, we see that, to show Theorem 5.4, it suffices to prove that

$$L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) = L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X}) \tag{5.16}$$

with equivalent norms. We divide the proof of (5.16) into the following two steps.

Step 1. We first prove the inclusion $L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \subset L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$. For any $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$, by the bounded functional calculus in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$, we know that there exists a positive constant $C_{(\Phi,\,M)}$ such that

$$f = C_{(\Phi,\,M)} \int_0^\infty \left(t^2L\right)^{M+1} \Phi(t\sqrt{L}) t^2 L e^{-t^2L} f\, \frac{dt}{t} = \pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}\left(t^2Le^{-t^2L}f\right)$$

in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, from the fact that $t^2Le^{-t^2L}f \in T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$, we deduce that there exist $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $\{A_j\}_j$ of $(T_\varphi,\, \infty)$-atoms, respectively, associated with $\{B_j\}_j$ such that

$$t^2Le^{-t^2L}f = \sum_j \lambda_j A_j$$

in $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+) \cap T_2^2(\mathcal{X}_+)$ and $\Lambda(\{\lambda_j A_j\}_j) \lesssim \|t^2Le^{-t^2L}f\|_{T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)}$, which, together with Proposition 5.6, implies that

$$f = \pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}\left(t^2Le^{-t^2L}f\right) = \sum_j \lambda_j \pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}(A_j)$$

in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. This, together with the fact that $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,M}(A_j)$ is a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-atom associated with B_j, immediately shows that $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$. Thus, $L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X}) \subset L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Step 2. We now prove the inclusion $L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X}) \subset L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$. By (5.14), we know that, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-atom a associated with the ball B, (5.15) holds, with S_L in place of T. Thus, by Lemma 5.7, we conclude that S_L is bounded from $H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ to $L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$, which immediately implies that, for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$, $\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})}$. This shows that $L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X}) \subset L^2(\mathcal{X}) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathcal{X})$, which, together with Step 1, completes the proof of (5.16) and hence Theorem 5.4. $\square$

Now, we consider the question of replacing the role of $L^2(\mathcal{X})$ norm by the more general $L^s(\mathcal{X})$ norm for $s \in (p_L,\, p_L')$, in the definition of the atomic Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$. We also introduce the following notion of the $L^s(\mathcal{X})$-adapted atomic Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,s}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Definition 5.8. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions (H_1) and (H_2), and p_L be as in Assumption (H_2). Assume that $q,\, s \in (p_L,\, p_L')$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$. For $f \in L^2(\mathcal{X})$, $f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j$ is called an *atomic* $(\varphi,\, q,\, s,\, M)_L$*-representation* of f, if each a_j is a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-atom associated with the ball $B_j \subset \mathcal{X}$, the summation converges in $L^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ satisfies that

$$\sum_j \varphi\left(B_j,\, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right) < \infty.$$

Let

$$\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,s}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X}) := \{f:\ f \text{ has an atomic } (\varphi,\, q,\, s,\, M)_L\text{-representation}\}$$

with the *quasi-norm* given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\|f\|_{H^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})}\\ &\quad := \inf\left\{\Lambda(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j):\ f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j \text{ is an atomic } (\varphi,\, q,\, s,\, M)_L\text{-representation}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where the infimum is taken over all the atomic $(\varphi,\, q,\, s,\, M)_L$-representations of f and

$$\Lambda\left(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j\right) := \inf\left\{\lambda \in (0,\, \infty):\ \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j,\, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right) \le 1\right\}.$$

The *atomic Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space* $H^{M,\,q,\,s}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ is then defined as the completion of $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q,\,s}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ with respect to the *quasi-norm* $\|\cdot\|_{H^{M,\,q,\,s}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})}$.

From its definition, we know that the space $H^{M,q}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ as in Definition 5.3 can be viewed as the $L^2(\mathcal{X})$-adapted atomic Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H^{M,q,2}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, we have the following equivalence between $H^{M,q,s}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^{M,q}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Theorem 5.9. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, L satisfy Assumptions* (H_1) *and* (H_2), *p_L be as in Assumption* (H_2) *and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - \frac{1}{p_L'})$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are respectively as in* (2.6) *and* (2.5). *Then, for all $s \in (p_L,\, p_L')$ and $q \in (I(\varphi)[r(\varphi)]', p_L')$, where $I(\varphi)$ and $r(\varphi)$ are respectively as in* (2.4) *and* (2.7), *$H^{M,q,s}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^{M,q}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

To prove Theorem 5.9, we need a few lemmas. This first one is a variant of Lemma 5.7, whose proof is similar. We omit the details.

Lemma 5.10. *Let* φ *be as in Definition 2.2,* L *satisfy Assumptions* (H_1) *and* (H_2)*,* p_L *be as in Assumption* (H_2)*,* $q,\, s \in (p_L,\, p_L')$ *and* $M \in \mathbb{N}$ *satisfying* $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - \frac{1}{p_L'})$*, where* $q(\varphi)$ *and* $i(\varphi)$ *are respectively as in* (2.6) *and* (2.5)*. Suppose that* T *is a linear (resp. nonnegative sublinear) operator which maps* $L^s(\mathcal{X})$ *continuously into weak-*$L^s(\mathcal{X})$*. If there exists a positive constant* C *such that, for any* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ *and* $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$*-atom* a *associated with the ball* B*,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi\left(x,\, T(\lambda a)(x)\right)\, d\mu(x) \le C\varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})}}\right),$$

then T *can extend to be a bounded linear (resp. sublinear) operator from* $H^{M,\,q,\,s}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ *to* $L^\varphi(\mathcal{X})$*.*

Lemma 5.11. *Let* φ *be as in Definition 2.2,* L *satisfy Assumptions* (H_1) *and* (H_2)*,* p_L *be as in Assumption* (H_2)*,* $q,\, s \in (p_L, p_L')$ *and* $M \in \mathbb{N}$ *satisfying* $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - \frac{1}{p_L'})$*, where* $q(\varphi)$ *and* $i(\varphi)$ *are respectively as in* (2.6) *and* (2.5)*. Assume further that* $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(p_L'/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$*, where* $I(\varphi)$ *is as in* (2.4)*. Then, for all* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*,*

(i) *the operator* $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}$*, initially defined on the space* $T_2^{s,\,b}(\mathcal{X}_+)$*, extends to a bounded linear operator from* $T_2^s(\mathcal{X}_+)$ *to* $L^s(\mathcal{X})$*;*

(ii) *for all* $t \in (0,\, \infty)$*, the operator* $t^2Le^{-t^2L}$*, initially defined on* $L^2(\mathcal{X})$*, extends to a bounded linear operator from* $L^s(\mathcal{X})$ *to* $T_2^s(\mathcal{X}_+)$*.*

Proof. We first prove (i). Let $f \in T_2^s(\mathcal{X}_+) \cap T_2^{2,\,b}(\mathcal{X}_+)$. For any $g \in L^{s'}(\mathcal{X}) \cap L^2(\mathcal{X})$, by Fubini's theorem, Assumption (H_1), Hölder's inequality and the $L^{s'}(\mathcal{X})$-boundedness of the square function $S_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}} \pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}(f)(x)g(x)\, d\mu(x)\right| &= \left|\int_0^\infty \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x,t)\left(t^2L\right)^k \Phi(t\sqrt{L})(g)(x)\, \frac{d\mu(x)\, dt}{t}\right| \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{A}f\|_{L^s(\mathcal{X})}\|S_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}(g)\|_{L^{s'}(\mathcal{X})} \lesssim \|f\|_{T^s(\mathcal{X}_+)}\|g\|_{L^{s'}(\mathcal{X})},\end{aligned}$$

which, together with the dual representation of $L^s(\mathcal{X})$ norm and a density argument, implies that $\pi_{\Phi,\,L,\,k}$ extends to a bounded linear operator from $T_2^s(\mathcal{X}_+)$ to $L^s(\mathcal{X})$. This shows that (i) is valid.

We now turn to the proof of (ii). By the definition of the Hardy space $H_L^p(\mathcal{X})$ (with $p \in (0,\, \infty)$) associated with operators satisfying Assumptions (H_1) and (H_2) in [39], together with an argument similar to that used in the proof of [41, Proposition 9.1(v)], we see that, for all $s \in (p_L,\, p_L')$, $H_L^s(\mathcal{X}) = L^s(\mathcal{X})$. This, combined with the definition of $H_L^s(\mathcal{X})$, immediately implies that the operator $t^2Le^{-t^2L}$ extends to a bounded linear operator from $L^s(\mathcal{X})$ to $T_2^s(\mathcal{X}_+)$. This shows (ii), which completes the proof of Lemma 5.11. ☐

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 5.9.

Proof of Theorem 5.9. The inclusion that $H^{M,\,q,\,s}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X}) \subset H^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ follows immediately from Theorem 5.4, Lemma 5.11 and (5.7). We now prove the inclusion $H^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X}) \subset H^{M,\,q,\,s}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$. To this end, we first recall the following Calderón reproducing formula, which is deduced from the bounded functional calculus in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. More precisely, let Φ be as in (5.3). For any $f\in L^2(\mathcal{X})\cap L^s(\mathcal{X})\cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$, we see that there exists a positive constant $C_{(\Phi,M)}$ such that

$$f=C_{(\Phi,M)}\int_0^\infty \left(t^2L\right)^{M+1}\Phi\left(t\sqrt{L}\right)t^2Le^{-t^2L}f\,\frac{dt}{t} \tag{5.17}$$

in $L^2(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, by Lemma 5.11(ii), we know that $t^2Le^{-t^2L}f\in T^s_2(\mathcal{X}_+)\cap T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$. Thus, by a slight modification of the proof of [42, Corollary 3.4], we conclude that there exist $\{\lambda_j\}_j\subset\mathbb{C}$ and a sequence of (T_φ,∞)-atoms $\{A_j\}_j$ associated with the balls $\{B_j\}_j$ such that

$$t^2Le^{-t^2L}f=\sum_j\lambda_jA_j$$

in $T^s(\mathcal{X}_+)$ and $T_\varphi(\mathcal{X}_+)$. Now, let $g\in L^2(\mathcal{X})\cap L^{s'}(\mathcal{X})$. From (5.17), Fubini's theorem and Assumption (H_1), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}}f(x)g(x)\,d\mu(x)&=\int_0^\infty\int_{\mathcal{X}}t^2Le^{-t^2L}f(x)\left(t^2L\right)^M\Phi(t\sqrt{L})g(x)\,\frac{d\mu(x)\,dt}{t}\\&=\sum_j\int_0^\infty\int_{\mathcal{X}}\lambda_jA_j(y,t)\left(t^2L\right)^M\Phi(t\sqrt{L})g(x)\,\frac{d\mu(x)\,dt}{t}\\&=\sum_j\int_{\mathcal{X}}\lambda_j\int_0^\infty\left(t^2L\right)^M\Phi(t\sqrt{L})(A_j)(x)\frac{dt}{t}g(x)\,d\mu(x)\\&=:\sum_j\int_{\mathcal{X}}\lambda_ja_j(x)g(x)\,d\mu(x).\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

By the proof of Proposition 5.6, we conclude that, for each $j\in\mathbb{N}$, a_j is a $(\varphi,q,M)_L$-atom associated with B_j. This, together with (5.18), implies that f has a $(\varphi,q,s,M)_L$-atomic representation $f=\sum_j\lambda_ja_j$ as in Definition 5.8. Thus, $f\in\widetilde{H}^{M,q,s}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$, which, together with the fact that $L^2(\mathcal{X})\cap L^s(\mathcal{X})\cap H^{M,q}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $H^{M,q}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ and a density argument, completes the proof of the inclusion $H^{M,q}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})\subset H^{M,q,s}_{\varphi,L,\mathrm{at}}(\mathcal{X})$ and hence Theorem 5.9. □

6 A sufficient condition for the equivalence between the spaces $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$

In this section, we give a sufficient condition on the operator L, satisfying Assumptions (A) and (B), such that $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms. We first recall some notions and properties of $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

In what follows, we denote by $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the *space of all Schwartz functions* and by $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ its *dual space* (namely, the *space of all tempered distributions*). For $m\in\mathbb{N}$, define

$$\mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{R}^n):=\left\{\phi\in\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n):\ \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n}\ \sup_{\beta\in\mathbb{Z}^n_+,\,|\beta|\le m+1}(1+|x|)^{(m+2)(n+1)}|\partial^\beta_x\phi(x)|\le1\right\}.$$

Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the *non-tangential grand maximal function* f_m^* of f is defined by setting,

$$f_m^*(x) := \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{S}_m(\mathbb{R}^n)} \sup_{|y-x|<t,\, t\in(0,\infty)} |f * \phi_t(y)|,$$

where for all $t \in (0,\infty)$, $\phi_t(\cdot) := t^{-n}\phi(\frac{\cdot}{t})$. When $m(\varphi) := \lfloor n[q(\varphi)/i(\varphi) - 1]\rfloor$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are, respectively, as in (2.6) and (2.5), we *denote* $f_{m(\varphi)}^*$ *simply by* f^*.

Now we recall the definition of the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ introduced by Ky [49] as follows.

Definition 6.1. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2. The *Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space* $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined to be the space of all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $f^* \in L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the *quasi-norm* $\|f\|_{H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \|f^*\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

To introduce the molecular Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space, we first introduce the notion of molecules associated with the growth function φ.

Definition 6.2. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, $q \in (1,\infty)$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$. A function $\alpha \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is called a $(\varphi,\, q,\, s,\, \varepsilon)$*-molecule* associated with the ball B if

(i) for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_j(B))} \le 2^{-j\varepsilon}|2^jB|^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1}$;

(ii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \alpha(x)x^\beta\,dx = 0$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ with $|\beta| \le s$.

Definition 6.3. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, $q \in (1,\infty)$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$. The *molecular Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space*, $H_{\varphi,\,\mathrm{mol}}^{q,\,s,\,\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, is defined to be the space of all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that $f = \sum_j \lambda_j\alpha_j$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $\{\alpha_j\}_j$ is a sequence of $(\varphi,\, q,\, s,\, \varepsilon)$-molecules respectively associated to the balls $\{B_j\}_j$, and

$$\sum_j \varphi\left(B_j,\, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right) < \infty,$$

where, for each j, the molecule α_j is associated with the ball B_j. Moreover, define

$$\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,\mathrm{mol}}^{q,\,s,\,\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \inf\left\{\Lambda\left(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j\right)\right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all decompositions of f as above and

$$\Lambda\left(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j\right) := \inf\left\{\lambda \in (0,\infty):\ \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right) \le 1\right\}.$$

Definition 6.4. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2.

(I) For each ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the *space* $L_\varphi^q(B)$ with $q \in [1,\infty]$ is defined to be the set of all measurable functions f on $\mathbb{R}^n$, supported in B, such that

$$\|f\|_{L_\varphi^q(B)} := \begin{cases} \sup\limits_{t\in(0,\infty)} \left[\dfrac{1}{\varphi(B,t)}\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f(x)|^q\varphi(x,t)\,dx\right]^{1/q} < \infty, & q \in [1,\infty),\\ \|f\|_{L^\infty(B)} < \infty, & q = \infty. \end{cases}$$

(II) A triplet $(\varphi,\, q,\, s)$ is said to be *admissible*, if $q \in (q(\varphi), \infty]$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying $s \geq \lfloor n[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - 1]\rfloor$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are respectively as in (2.6) and (2.5). A measurable function a on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called a $(\varphi,\, q,\, s)$-*atom*, if there exists a ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

(i) $\operatorname{supp} a \subset B$;

(ii) $\|a\|_{L^q_\varphi(B)} \leq \|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}$;

(iii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} a(x) x^\alpha \, dx = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^n_+$ with $|\alpha| \leq s$.

(III) The *atomic Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space*, $H^{\varphi,\, q,\, s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, is defined to be the space of all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying that $f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $\{a_j\}_j$ is a sequence of $(\varphi,\, q,\, s)$-atoms associated with $\{B_j\}_j$, and

$$\sum_j \varphi\left(B_j,\, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right) < \infty.$$

Moreover, let

$$\Lambda(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j) := \inf\left\{\lambda \in (0,\infty) :\ \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j,\, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right) \leq 1\right\}.$$

The *quasi-norm* of $f \in H^{\varphi,\, q,\, s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined by $\|f\|_{H^{\varphi,\, q,\, s}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \inf\{\Lambda(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j)\}$, where the infimum is taken over all the decompositions of f as above.

Then we have the following conclusion, which is just [42, Theorem 4.11].

Lemma 6.5. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2. Assume that $(\varphi,\, q,\, s)$ is admissible, $\epsilon \in (\max\{n+s, nq(\varphi)/i(\varphi)\}, \infty)$ and $p \in (q(\varphi)[r(\varphi)]', \infty)$, where $q(\varphi)$, $i(\varphi)$ and $r(\varphi)$ are, respectively, as in* (2.6), (2.5) *and* (2.7). *Then $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H^{\varphi,\, q,\, s}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H^{p,\, s,\, \epsilon}_{\varphi,\, \mathrm{mol}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

Throughout this section, we always assume that the operator L satisfies the following additional assumption.

Assumption (C). The *distribution kernels* h_t of e^{-tL} satisfy that there exist positive constants C, $\widetilde{c}$, $c \in (0,\infty)$ and $\nu \in (0,1]$ such that, for all $t \in (0,\infty)$ and almost every x, y, $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $2|h| \leq t^{1/2m} + |x-y|$,

$$|h_t(x,y)| + |h_t(y,x)| \leq \frac{C}{t^{n/2m}} \exp\left\{-\frac{c|x-y|^{2m/(2m-1)}}{t^{1/(2m-1)}}\right\}, \tag{6.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &|h_t(x+h,y) - h_t(x,y)| + |h_t(x,y+h) - h_t(x,y)| \\ &\quad \leq \frac{C}{t^{n/2m}} \left(\frac{|h|}{t^{1/2m} + |x-y|}\right)^\nu \exp\left\{-\frac{\widetilde{c}|x-y|^{2m/(2m-1)}}{t^{1/(2m-1)}}\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h_t(x,y)\, dx \equiv 1 \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h_t(x,y)\, dy. \tag{6.3}$$

Remark 6.6. (i) If the operator L satisfies Assumption (C), then L satisfies Assumption (B) with $p_L = 1$ and $q_L = \infty$.

(ii) Let $L := -\mathrm{div}(A\nabla)$ be the divergence form elliptic operator in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where A has real entries when $n \geq 3$ and complex entries when $n \in \{1, 2\}$. By [9, Chapter 1], we know that the operator L satisfies Assumptions (A) and (C).

We now in the position to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.7. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2 and L satisfy Assumptions* (A) *and* (C). *Assume that $q(\varphi) < \frac{n+\nu}{n}$ and $i(\varphi) \in (\frac{nq(\varphi)}{n+\nu}, 1]$, where ν, $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are, respectively, as in* (6.2)*,* (2.6) *and* (2.5)*. Then $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

Proof. Let $f \in H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $q \in (q(\varphi)[r(\varphi)]', \infty)$. Then from Lemma 6.5, we deduce that there exist $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $\{a_j\}_j$ of $(\varphi,\, q,\, 0)$-atoms such that

$$f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j \tag{6.4}$$

in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and

$$\|f\|_{H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} \sim \Lambda(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j). \tag{6.5}$$

Moreover, by $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the proof of [49, Theorem 3.4], we know that (6.4) also holds in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus, to prove $f \in H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, it suffices to show that, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi,\, q,\, 0)$-atom a associated with the ball B,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(x, S_L(\lambda a)(x)\right)\, dx \lesssim \varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right). \tag{6.6}$$

Indeed, if (6.6) holds true, by (6.4) and (6.5), we see that $\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \Lambda(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j) \sim \|f\|_{H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

Now we prove (6.6). From (6.2) and (6.3), we deduce that the kernel of $t^{2m}Le^{-t^{2m}L}$, $q_{t^{2m}}$, satisfies that, for any $\gamma \in (0, \nu)$, there exists a positive constant C_1 such that for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ and almost every x, y, $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $2|h| \leq t + |x-y|$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|q_{t^{2m}}(x+h, y) - q_{t^{2m}}(x, y)| + |q_{t^{2m}}(x, y+h) - q_{t^{2m}}(x, y)| \\
&\quad \lesssim \frac{1}{t^n}\left(\frac{|h|}{t+|x-y|}\right)^\gamma \exp\left\{-\frac{C_1|x-y|^{2m/(2m-1)}}{t^{2m/(2m-1)}}\right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q_{t^{2m}}(x, y)\, dx = 0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} q_{t^{2m}}(x, y)\, dy.$$

Write

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(x, S_L(\lambda a)(x)\right)\, dx = \int_{8B} \varphi\left(x, S_L(\lambda a)(x)\right)\, dx + \int_{(8B)^\complement} \cdots =: \mathrm{I}_1 + \mathrm{I}_2. \tag{6.8}$$

Moreover, since $q > q(\varphi)[r(\varphi)]'$, it follows that there exists $p \in (1, \infty)$ such that $p > [r(\varphi)]'$ and $q/p > q(\varphi)$, which implies that $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{q/p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. From this, Hölder's inequality and Definition 2.1, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}\|a\|_{L^p(B)}^p &\le \left\{\int_B |a(x)|^q \varphi\left(x, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)}^{-1}\right)\,dx\right\}^{p/q}\\ &\quad\times \left\{\int_B \left[\varphi\left(x, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)}^{-1}\right)\right]^{-\frac{p}{q}(\frac{q}{p})'}\,dx\right\}^{1/(q/p)'} \lesssim \|a\|_{L^q_\varphi(B)}^p |B|,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\|a\|_{L^p(B)} \lesssim \|a\|_{L^q_\varphi(B)} |B|^{1/p}. \tag{6.9}$$

By this, the uniformly upper type 1 property of φ, Hölder's inequality and the $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of S_L, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I}_1 &\lesssim \int_{8B} \varphi\left(x, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)}^{-1}\right)\left[1 + \|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)} S_L(a)(x)\right]\,dx\\ &\lesssim \left[1 + \|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)} |8B|^{-1/p} \|a\|_{L^p(B)}\right] \varphi\left(B, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)}^{-1}\right)\\ &\lesssim \varphi\left(B, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(B)}^{-1}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

Now we estimate I_2. For any $x \in (8B)^\complement$, we first write

$$\begin{aligned}[S_L(a)(x)]^2 &= \int_0^{r_B} \int_{B(x,t)} \left|\int_B q_{t^{2k}}(y,z) a(z)\,dz\right|^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t} + \int_{r_B}^\infty \cdots\\ &=: \mathrm{E}_1(x) + \mathrm{E}_2(x).\end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

Notice that, for any $x \in (8B)^\complement$, $y \in B(x,t)$ with $t \in (0, r_B)$ and $z \in B$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}|y - z| &\ge |x - z| - |x - y| \ge |x - x_B| - |z - x_B| - r_B\\ &\ge |x - x_B| - 2r_B \ge \frac{1}{2}|x - x_B|.\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

Moreover, similar the proof of (6.9), we see that

$$\|a\|_{L^1(B)} \le \|a\|_{L^q_\varphi(B)} |B|. \tag{6.13}$$

Let $s \in [n+\nu, \infty)$. Then from (6.12), (6.13) and (6.1), we deduce that, for all $x \in (8B)^\complement$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}_1(x) &\lesssim \int_0^{r_B} \int_{B(x,t)} \left[\int_B \frac{1}{t^n} e^{-(\frac{\tilde{c}|y-z|}{t})^{2m/(2m-1)}} |a(z)|\,dz\right]^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}}\\ &\lesssim \int_0^{r_B} \int_{B(x,t)} \frac{1}{t^{2n}} \left(\frac{t}{|x - x_B|}\right)^{2s} \|a\|_{L^1(B)}^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}}\\ &\lesssim \frac{r_B^{2(s-n)}}{|x - x_B|^{2s}} \|a\|_{L^1(B)}^2 \lesssim \frac{r_B^{2s}}{|x - x_B|^{2s}} \|a\|_{L^q_\varphi(B)}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

Now we deal with $\mathrm{E}_2(x)$. By $n+\nu > nq(\varphi)/i(\varphi)$, we know that there exist $q_0 \in (q(\varphi),\infty)$, $p_0 \in (0, i(\varphi))$ and $\gamma \in (0,\nu)$ such that $n+\gamma > nq_0/p_0$, which further implies that there exists $\gamma_1 \in (0,\gamma)$ satisfying that

$$n+\gamma-\gamma_1 > nq_0/p_0. \tag{6.15}$$

Moreover, for any $x \in (8B)^{\complement}$, $y \in B(x,t)$ with $t \in (r_B,\infty)$, and $z \in B$, it holds that $t+|y-z| \geq |x-z| \geq \frac{1}{2}|x-x_B|$, which, together with $\int_B a(x)\,dx = 0$, (6.7) and (6.13), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}_2(x) &\lesssim \int_{r_B}^{\infty}\int_{B(x,t)}\left[\int_B |q_{t^{2m}}(y,z)-q_{t^{2m}}(y,x_B)||a(z)|\,dz\right]^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}}\\
&\lesssim \int_{r_B}^{\infty}\int_{B(x,t)}\left[\int_B \frac{|z-x_B|^{\gamma}}{(t+|y-z|)^{n+\gamma}}|a(z)|\,dz\right]^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}}\\
&\lesssim \int_{r_B}^{\infty}\int_{B(x,t)}\left[\int_B \frac{r_B^{\gamma}}{t^{\gamma_1}|x-x_B|^{n+\gamma-\gamma_1}}|a(z)|\,dz\right]^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}}\\
&\lesssim \frac{r_B^{2\gamma}}{|x-x_B|^{2(n+\gamma-\gamma_1)}}\|a\|^2_{L^1(B)}\int_{r_B}^{\infty} t^{-2\gamma_1-1}\,dt\\
&\lesssim \frac{r_B^{2(\gamma-\gamma_1)}}{|x-x_B|^{2(n+\gamma-\gamma_1)}}\|a\|^2_{L^q_\varphi(B)}|B|^2 \lesssim \frac{r_B^{2(n+\gamma-\gamma_1)}}{|x-x_B|^{2(n+\gamma-\gamma_1)}}\|\chi_B\|^{-2}_{L^\varphi(B)}.
\end{aligned}$$

From this, (6.11) and (6.14), it follows that, for all $x \in (8B)^{\complement}$,

$$S_L(a)(x) \lesssim \frac{r_B^{n+\gamma-\gamma_1}}{|x-x_B|^{n+\gamma-\gamma_1}}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(B)},$$

which, together with the uniformly lower type p_0 properties of φ, Lemma 2.5(vi) and (6.15), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}_2 &\lesssim \int_{(8B)^{\complement}} \varphi\left(x, |\lambda| S_L(a)(x)\right)\,dx\\
&\lesssim \int_{(8B)^{\complement}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{r_B^{n+\gamma-\gamma_1}|\lambda|}{|x-x_B|^{n+\gamma-\gamma_1}}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(B)}\right)\,dx\\
&\lesssim \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} \varphi\left(2^j B, 2^{-(n+\gamma-\gamma_1)j}|\lambda|\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(B)}\right)\\
&\lesssim \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} 2^{-(n+\gamma-\gamma_1)p_0 j+nq_0}\varphi\left(B, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(B)}\right) \lesssim \varphi\left(B, |\lambda|\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(B)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By this, (6.8) and (6.10), we see that (6.6) holds true.

Now we prove that $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By Theorem 4.8 and Lemma 6.5, we only need to show that, for any given $(\varphi,\, p_1,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule α, it holds that α is a $(\varphi,\, p_1,\, 0,\, \epsilon)$-molecule as in Definition 6.2, where $p_1 \in (q(\varphi), \infty)$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > \frac{nq(\varphi)}{2mi(\varphi)}$, and $\epsilon \in (nq(\varphi)/i(\varphi), \infty)$. Indeed, compared with Definitions 4.3 and 6.2, we know that, to show our conclusion, it suffices to prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \alpha(x)\, dx = 0. \tag{6.16}$$

By the H_∞-bounded functional calculus, we know that, for all $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $p \in (1, p_1]$,

$$(I+L)^{-1} f = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} e^{-tL} f\, dt,$$

which, together with Fubini's theorem and (6.3), implies that, for all $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (I+L)^{-1} f(x)\, dx = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-tL} f(x)\, dx\, dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)\, dx. \tag{6.17}$$

Moreover, by the definition of α, we know that $\alpha \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and there exists $b \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\alpha = Lb$. From this and (6.17), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \alpha(x)\, dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (I+L)^{-1} Lb(x)\, dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (I+L)^{-1}(I+L) b(x)\, dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (I+L)^{-1} b(x)\, dx = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (6.16).

By the above proofs, we see that $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms, which, together with the fact that $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are, respectively, dense in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and a density argument, implies that the spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms. This finishes the proof of Theorem 6.7. $\square$

7 The Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space associated with the second order elliptic operator in divergence form

In this section, we study the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated with the second order elliptic operator in divergence form on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with complex bounded measurable coefficients. By making full use of the special structure of the divergence form elliptic operator, we establish the radial and non-tangential maximal function characterizations of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ based respectively on the heat and Poisson semigroups of L. Moreover, we establish the boundedness of the associated Riesz transform on $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

7.1 Maximal function characterizations of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$

We begin this subsection by recalling some necessary notions and notation. Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix with entries $\{a_{i,\,j}\}_{i,\,j=1}^n \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n,\, \mathbb{C})$ satisfying the *ellipticity condition*, namely, there exist constants $0 < \lambda_A \le \Lambda_A < \infty$ such that, for all $\xi,\, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ and almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\lambda_A|\xi|^2 \le \Re e\langle A(x)\xi, \xi\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\langle A(x)\xi, \zeta\rangle| \le \Lambda_A|\xi||\zeta|,$$

where $\langle\cdot,\, \cdot\rangle$ denotes the *inner product* in $\mathbb{C}$ and $\Re e\, \xi$ denotes the *real part* of the complex number ξ. Then the *second order elliptic operator* L *in divergence form* is defined by

$$Lf := -\mathrm{div}(A\nabla f), \tag{7.1}$$

interpreted in the weak sense via a sesquilinear form. It is well known that there exists a positive constant $\omega \in [0,\, \pi/2)$ such that the operator L is of type ω on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and L has a bounded H_∞-functional calculus on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see, for example, [1, 41]). Moreover, let $(p_-(L),\, p_+(L))$ be the *interior of the maximal interval of exponents* $p \in [1,\, \infty]$ *for which the semigroup* $\{e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$, *generated by* L, *is* $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *bounded.* By [4, Proposition 3.2] (see also [41, Lemma 2.25]), we conclude that, for all $p_-(L) < p \le q < p_+(L)$, $\{e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$ satisfy the $L^p - L^q$ off-diagonal estimates. Thus, L satisfies Assumptions (A) and (B) with $k = 2$. Therefore, a corresponding theory of the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, including its molecular characterization (see Theorem 4.8) is already known.

We also recall the definitions of some maximal functions associated with L from [40]. Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the *radial maximal functions*, $\mathcal{R}_h^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{R}_P^\alpha$, respectively associated with the heat semigroup and Poisson semigroup generated by L are defined by setting, for all $\alpha \in (0,\, \infty)$, $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathcal{R}_h^\alpha(f)(x) := \sup_{t>0}\left\{\frac{1}{(\alpha t)^n}\int_{B(x,\, \alpha t)}\left|e^{-t^2L}(f)(y)\right|^2\, dy\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{7.2}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_P^\alpha(f)(x) := \sup_{t>0}\left\{\frac{1}{(\alpha t)^n}\int_{B(x,\, \alpha t)}\left|e^{-t\sqrt{L}}(f)(y)\right|^2\, dy\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{7.3}$$

Similarly, the *non-tangential maximal functions*, $\mathcal{N}_h^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{N}_P^\alpha$, respectively associated with the heat semigroup and Poisson semigroup generated by L are defined by setting, for all $\alpha \in (0,\, \infty)$, $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathcal{N}_h^\alpha(f)(x) := \sup_{(y,t)\in\Gamma_\alpha(x)}\left\{\frac{1}{(\alpha t)^n}\int_{B(y,\alpha t)}\left|e^{-t^2L}(f)(z)\right|^2\, dz\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{7.4}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_P^\alpha(f)(x) := \sup_{(y,t)\in\Gamma_\alpha(x)}\left\{\frac{1}{(\alpha t)^n}\int_{B(y,\alpha t)}\left|e^{-t\sqrt{L}}(f)(z)\right|^2\, dz\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{7.5}$$

where above and in what follows, $\Gamma_\alpha(x) := \{(y,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (0,\infty) :\ |x-y| < \alpha t\}$. In what follows, when $\alpha = 1$, we remove the superscript α for simplicity. We also define the *Lusin-area functions*, S_h and S_P, associated respectively to the heat semigroup and Poisson semigroup by setting, for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$S_h(f)(x) := \left\{ \int_{\Gamma(x)} \left| t\nabla e^{-t^2 L}(f)(y) \right|^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{7.6}$$

and

$$S_P(f)(x) := \left\{ \int_{\Gamma(x)} \left| t\nabla e^{-t\sqrt{L}}(f)(y) \right|^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{7.7}$$

We first introduce the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space, defined via the above maximal functions, as follows.

Definition 7.1. Let φ and L be respectively as in Definition 2.2 and (7.1), and S_P as in (7.7). The *S_P-adapted Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space* $H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined to be the completion of the *set*

$$\left\{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) :\ \|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \|S_P(f)\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty \right\}$$

with respect to the *quasi-norm* $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

In a similar way, the *S_h-adapted*, *$\mathcal{R}_h$-adapted*, *$\mathcal{R}_P$-adapted*, *$\mathcal{N}_h$-adapted* and *$\mathcal{N}_P$-adapted Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy spaces*,

$$H_{\varphi,\,S_h}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

are also defined.

Following [4], let $(q_-(L),\, q_+(L))$ be the *interior of the maximal interval of exponents* $p \in [1,\, \infty]$, *for which the family of operators*, $\{\sqrt{t}\nabla e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$, *is* $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *bounded.* From [4, Proposition 3.7], it follows that $q_-(L) = p_-(L)$ and $q_+(L) > 2$. Moreover, by [4, Corollary 3.8 and Proposition 3.9], we know that, for all $q_-(L) < p \le q < q_+(L)$, the family of operators, $\{\sqrt{t}\nabla e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$, satisfies the $L^p - L^q$ off-diagonal estimates.

For the operator S_P, we have the following boundedness.

Lemma 7.2. *Let S_h and S_P be respectively as in* (7.6) *and* (7.7)*. Then, for all $p \in (q_-(L),\, q_+(L))$, both S_h and S_P are bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

The proof of Lemma 7.2 follows from a similar method used for the vertical Lusin-area function associated with the heat semigroup (see [4, Theorem 6.1]). We omit the details here.

Lemma 7.3. *Let φ and L be respectively as in Definition 2.2 and* (7.1)*,*

$$q \in (q_-(L),\, \min\{q_+(L),\, p_+(L)\})$$

and $M\in\mathbb{N}$. *Then, there exists a positive constant* C *such that, for all* $t\in(0,\infty)$, *close sets* $E,\,F\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ *satisfying* $d(E,\,F)>0$ *and* $f\in L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with* $\operatorname{supp} f\subset E$,

$$\left\{\int_0^\infty \left\|s\nabla e^{-s^2L}\left(I-e^{-t^2L}\right)^M f\right\|_{L^q(F)}^2\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\le C\left[\frac{t}{d(E,\,F)}\right]^{2M}\|f\|_{L^q(E)} \tag{7.8}$$

and

$$\left\{\int_0^\infty \left\|s\nabla e^{-s^2L}\left(t^2Le^{-t^2L}\right)^M f\right\|_{L^q(F)}^2\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\le C\left[\frac{t}{d(E,\,F)}\right]^{2M}\|f\|_{L^q(E)}. \tag{7.9}$$

Proof. We first prove (7.8). To this end, by the change of variable, we write

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{\int_0^\infty \left\|s\nabla e^{-s^2L}\left(I-e^{-t^2L}\right)^M f\right\|_{L^q(F)}^2\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\\&\quad\lesssim\left\{\int_0^t \left\|s\nabla e^{-s^2(M+1)L}\left(I-e^{-t^2L}\right)^M f\right\|_{L^q(F)}^2\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}+\left\{\int_t^\infty\cdots\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\\&\quad=:\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{K}.\end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

For H, we deduce, from the binomial theorem, Assumption (B) and the fact when $t\ge s$, $(kt\nabla e^{-(kt)^2L})(s\nabla e^{-s^2(M+1)L})$ satisfies the L^q off-diagonal estimates in $(kt)^2$ (see, for example, [41, Lemma 2.22]), that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{H}&\lesssim\left\{\int_0^t \left\|s\nabla e^{-s^2(M+1)L}f\right\|_{L^q(F)}^2\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\\&\quad+\sup_{1\le k\le M}\left\{\int_0^t\left\|\left(kt\nabla e^{-(kt)^2L}\right)\left(e^{-s^2(M+1)L}\right)f\right\|_{L^q(F)}^2\frac{s^2ds}{t^2s}\right\}^{\frac12}\\&\lesssim\left\{\left[\int_0^t\exp\left\{-\frac{[d(E,\,F)]^2}{s^2}\right\}\frac{ds}{s}\right]^{\frac12}\right.\\&\quad\left.+\sup_{1\le k\le M}\left[\int_0^t\exp\left\{-\frac{[d(E,\,F)]^2}{(kt)^2}\right\}\frac{sds}{t^2}\right]^{\frac12}\right\}\|f\|_{L^q(E)}\lesssim\left[\frac{t}{d(E,\,F)}\right]^{2M}\|f\|_{L^q(E)}.\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{K}&\lesssim\left\{\int_t^\infty\left\|s\nabla e^{-s^2L}\left(e^{-s^2L}-e^{-(s^2+t^2)L}\right)^M f\right\|_{L^q(F)}^2\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\\&\lesssim\left[\int_t^\infty\exp\left\{-\frac{[d(E,\,F)]^2}{s^2}\right\}\left(\frac{t^2}{s^2}\right)^{2M}\frac{ds}{s}\right]^{\frac12}\|f\|_{L^q(E)}\\&\lesssim\left[\frac{t}{d(E,\,F)}\right]^{2M}\|f\|_{L^q(E)},\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (7.10) and (7.11), shows immediately that (7.8) holds. The proof of (7.9) is similar to that of (7.8). We omit the details here. □

Now, we are in the position to state our first main result in this section.

Proposition 7.4. *Let φ and L be respectively as in Definition 2.2 and* (7.1)*, S_h and S_P respectively as in* (7.6) *and* (7.7)*. Assume further that $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(\min\{p_+(L),\, q_+(L)\}/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$, where $I(\varphi)$ is as in* (2.4)*. Then $H_{\varphi,\, S_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\, S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

Proof. We prove Proposition 7.4 by first showing that $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms, whose proof is divided into two different directions of inclusions. We first prove the inclusion $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$\widetilde{S}_P(f)(x) := \left\{ \int_{\Gamma(x)} \left| t^2 L e^{-t\sqrt{L}}(f)(y) \right|^2 \frac{dy\, dt}{t^{n+1}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

From the proof of [40, Lemma 5.4], we deduce that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\widetilde{S}_P(f)(x) \lesssim S_P(f)(x)$, which immediately implies that

$$\left\| \widetilde{S}_P(f) \right\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|S_P(f)\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{7.12}$$

Moreover, by the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of S_P (see, for example, [40, (5.15)]), we know that

$$\left\| \widetilde{S}_P(f) \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|S_P(f)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Thus, $t^2 L e^{-t\sqrt{L}} f \in T_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+) \cap T_2^2(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$. Using the bounded H_∞-functional calculus in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we see that $f = \pi_{L,\, M}(t^2 L e^{-t\sqrt{L}} f)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\pi_{L,\, M}$ is as in (4.2), which, combining with Proposition 4.5 and (7.12), implies that

$$\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \left\| t^2 L e^{-t\sqrt{L}} f \right\|_{T_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)} \sim \left\| \widetilde{S}_P(f) \right\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\, S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty.$$

This shows $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and hence the inclusion $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Now, we prove the inclusion $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\, S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. To this end, it suffices to show that the operator S_P is bounded from $H_{\varphi,\, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, by Corollary 4.7, we only need to show that, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule α associated with B,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(x,\, S_P(\lambda\alpha)(x)\right) dx \lesssim \varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right), \tag{7.13}$$

where $q \in (p_-(L), \min\{p_+(L), q_+(L)\})$, $\epsilon \in (0,\, \infty)$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ can be chosen sufficiently large.

To prove (7.13), we first write

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\, S_P(\lambda\alpha)(x)\right)\,dx\\
&\quad\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\, S_P\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M(\lambda\alpha)(x)\right)\,dx\\
&\qquad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\, S_P\left[I-\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\right](\lambda\alpha)(x)\right)\,dx=:\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{J}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.14}
$$

For I, let $p_1\in[I(\varphi),\,1]$ and $p_2\in(0,\,i(\varphi))$ such that φ is of uniformly upper type p_1 and lower type p_2. By Minkowski's inequality and Lemma 2.4(i), we conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}&\lesssim\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\varphi\left(x,\,|\lambda|S_P\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(x)\right)\,dx\\
&\lesssim\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\left\{\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\left[S_P\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(x)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right]^{p_1}\right.\\
&\qquad\times\varphi\left(x,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\,dx\\
&\qquad+\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\left[S_P\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(x)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right]^{p_2}\\
&\qquad\left.\times\varphi\left(x,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\,dx\right\}=:\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\left\{\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_{i,\,j}+\widetilde{\mathrm{II}}_{i,\,j}\right\}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.15}
$$

We first estimate $\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_{i,\,j}$ in the case when $j\in\{0,\,\ldots,\,4\}$. Let $q\geq 2$ and

$$
q\in\left(I(\varphi)[r(\varphi)]',\,[q_+(L)]'\right)\cap\left(p_-(L),\,\min\{p_+(L),\,q_+(L)\}\right)
\tag{7.16}
$$

such that (5.8) holds true. Let $\widetilde{p}\in(q(\varphi),\,\infty)$. Then $\varphi\in\mathbb{RH}_{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap\mathbb{A}_{\widetilde{p}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This, together with Hölder's inequality, Lemma 7.3 and the $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of the semigroup $\{e^{-tL}\}_{t>0}$ for $q\in(p_-(L),\,p_+(L))$, implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_{i,\,j}&\lesssim\left\{\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\left[S_P\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(x)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right]^q\right\}^{\frac{p_1}{q}}\\
&\quad\times\left\{\frac{1}{|2^{i+j}B|}\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\left[\varphi\left(x,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\right]^{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}\,dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}}\\
&\quad\times\left|2^{i+j}B\right|^{\frac{1}{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}}\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{p_1}\\
&\lesssim\|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_i(B))}^{p_1}\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{p_1}\left|2^{i+j}B\right|^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}\left\{\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\varphi\left(x,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\,dx\right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

From this, Definition 4.3 and Lemma 2.5(vii), we deduce that

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_{i,j} \lesssim 2^{-ip_1[\epsilon+\frac{n}{q}-\frac{n\widetilde{q}}{p_1}]}\varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right),$$

when $\epsilon > n(\frac{\widetilde{q}}{p_1} - \frac{1}{q})$.

We now estimate $\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_{i,\,j}$ in the case when $j \geq 5$. Similar to the case when $j \leq 4$, we first have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_{i,\,j} &\lesssim 2^{-(i+j)n(\frac{p_1}{q}-\widetilde{q})}\|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}|B|^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}\varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\\
&\quad\times\left\{\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\left[S_P\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(x)\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right]^q\right\}^{\frac{p_1}{q}}\\
&=: 2^{-(i+j)n(\frac{p_1}{q}-\widetilde{q})}\|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}|B|^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}\varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)(\mathcal{A}_{i,\,j})^{p_1}\,.
\end{aligned}\tag{7.17}$$

For $\mathcal{A}_{i,\,j}$, since $q \geq 2$, by the dual norm representation of the $L^{\frac{q}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$-norm, we know that there exists $g \in L^{(\frac{q}{2})'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with $\|g\|_{L^{(\frac{q}{2})'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{i,\,j} &\sim \left\{\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\left[\int_{\Gamma(x)}\left|t\nabla e^{-t\sqrt{L}}\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(y)\right|^2\frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}}\right]^{\frac{q}{2}}dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}\\
&\sim \left\{\int_{S_j(2^iB)}\left[\int_{\Gamma(x)}\left|t\nabla e^{-t\sqrt{L}}\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(y)\right|^2\frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}}\right]g(x)\,dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\lesssim \left\{\int_0^\infty\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus(2^{i+j-2}B)}\left|t\nabla e^{-t\sqrt{L}}\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(y)\right|^2\right.\\
&\quad\left.\times\,\mathcal{M}(g)(y)\,\frac{dy\,dt}{t}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}+\sum_{k=0}^{j-2}\left\{\int_{2^i(2^{j-1}-2^k)r_B}^\infty\int_{S_k(2^iB)}\cdots\frac{dy\,dt}{t}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&=: \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i,\,j}+\sum_{k=0}^{j-2}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i,\,j,\,k},
\end{aligned}\tag{7.18}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ denotes the classical Hardy-Littlewood maximal function.

To estimate $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i,\,j}$, we need the following *subordination formula*,

$$e^{-t\sqrt{L}} = C\int_0^\infty\frac{e^{-u}}{\sqrt{u}}e^{-\frac{t^2L}{4u}}\,du,\tag{7.19}$$

where C is a positive constant. By using Hölder's inequality, (7.19), Minkowski's integral inequality, the $L^{(\frac{q}{2})'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function and Lemma 7.2, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.20)\quad \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i,\,j} &\lesssim \left\{\int_0^\infty \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus(2^{i+j-2}B)} \left|t\nabla e^{-t\sqrt{L}}\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M \left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(y)\right|^q\,dy\right]^{\frac{2}{q}}\,\frac{dt}{t}\right\}^{\frac12}\\
&\lesssim \int_0^\infty e^{-u}\left\{\int_0^\infty \left\|\frac{t}{\sqrt{4u}}\nabla e^{-\frac{t^2}{4u}L}\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\right.\right.\\
&\quad\left.\left.\times\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)(y)\right\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n\setminus(2^{i+j-2}B))}\,\frac{dt}{t}\right\}^{\frac12}\,du\\
&\lesssim \int_0^\infty e^{-u}\left[\frac{r_B}{2^{i+j}r_B}\right]^{2M}\,du\|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_i(B))}\lesssim 2^{-(i+j)M}\|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_i(B))}.
\end{aligned}$$

We continue to estimate $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i,\,j,\,k}$. Similar to the estimates for $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i,\,j}$, we first conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i,\,j,\,k} &\lesssim \int_0^\infty e^{-u}\left\{\int_{2^i(2^{j-1}-2^k)r_B}^\infty \left\|\frac{t}{\sqrt{4u}}\nabla e^{-\frac{t^2}{4u}L}\left(I-e^{-r_B^2L}\right)^M\right.\right.\\
&\quad\left.\left.\times\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)\right\|_{L^q(S_k(2^iB))}^2\,\frac{dt}{t}\right\}^{\frac12}\,du\\
&\lesssim \int_0^\infty e^{-u}\left\{\int_{\frac{[2^i(2^{j-1}-2^k)r_B]^2}{4u(M+1)}}^\infty \left\|\sqrt{s}\nabla e^{-sL}\left[\frac{s}{r_B^2}\left(e^{-sL}-e^{-(s+r_B^2)L}\right)\right]^M\right.\right.\\
&\quad\left.\left.\times\left(\chi_{S_i(B)}\alpha\right)\right\|_{L^q(S_k(2^iB))}^2\left(\frac{r_B^2}{s}\right)^{2M}\,\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\,du.
\end{aligned}$$

By the L^q off-diagonal estimates (similar to the estimates used in (7.11)) and the change of variable (let $\widetilde{s}:=\frac{(2^{i+j}r_B)^2}{1+u}\frac{1}{s}$), we further find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i,\,j,\,k} &\lesssim \|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_i(B))}\int_0^\infty e^{-u}\left\{\int_{\frac{[2^i(2^{j-1}-2^k)r_B]^2}{4u(M+1)}}^\infty \exp\left\{-\frac{[2^{i+j}r_B]^2}{s(1+u)}\right\}\left(\frac{r_B^2}{s}\right)^{2M}\,\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\,du\\
&\lesssim \|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_i(B))}\int_0^\infty e^{-u}\left\{\int_0^{\frac{4u(M+1)}{[2^i(2^{j-1}-2^k)r_B]^2}\frac{(2^{i+j}r_B)^2}{1+u}} e^{-s}\left[\frac{r_B^2s(1+u)}{(2^{i+j}r_B)^2}\right]^{2M}\,\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\,du\\
&\lesssim 2^{2(i+j)M}\|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_i(B))}\int_0^\infty (1+u)^Me^{-u}\left\{\int_0^1 s^{2M}e^{-s}\,\frac{ds}{s}\right\}^{\frac12}\,du\\
&\lesssim 2^{2(i+j)M}\|\alpha\|_{L^q(S_i(B))},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (7.17), (7.18), (7.20) and Definition 4.3, implies that, when $j\ge5$,

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_{i,\,j}\lesssim 2^{-(i+j)n(\frac{p_1}{q}-\widetilde{q})}\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{p_1}|B|^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)(\mathcal{A}_{i,\,j})^{p_1}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim 2^{-(i+j)p_1[2M+n(\frac{p_1}{q}-\widetilde{q})]}\|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}|B|^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\|\alpha\|^{p_1}_{L^q(S_i(B))}\\
&\lesssim 2^{-(i+j)p_1[2M+n(\frac{p_1}{q}-\widetilde{q})]}2^{-i\epsilon p_1}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar to the estimates for $\widetilde{\mathrm{I}}_{i,\,j}$, we see that

$$
\widetilde{\mathrm{II}}_{i,\,j}\lesssim 2^{-(i+j)p_2[2M+n(\frac{p_2}{q}-\widetilde{q})]}2^{-i\epsilon p_2}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right),
$$

which, combining with (7.15), implies that

$$
\mathrm{I}\lesssim\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right). \tag{7.21}
$$

Also, by following the same way as the estimates for I, we know that $\mathrm{J}\lesssim(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}})$, which, together with (7.14) and (7.21), shows that (7.13) holds true.

The proof for the equivalence of $H_{\varphi,\,S_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is similar. We omit the details here. This finishes the proof of Proposition 7.4. □

Now, we state the maximal function characterizations of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as follows.

Theorem 7.5. *Let φ and L be respectively as in Definition 2.2 and* (7.1)*, $\mathcal{R}_h$, $\mathcal{R}_P$, $\mathcal{N}_h$ and $\mathcal{N}_P$ respectively as in* (7.2)*,* (7.3)*,* (7.4) *and* (7.5)*. Assume further that $\varphi\in\mathbb{RH}_{(\min\{p_+(L),\,q_+(L)\}/I(\varphi))'}(\mathcal{X})$, where $I(\varphi)$ is as in* (2.4)*. Then $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

Remark 7.6. Theorem 7.5 completely covers [46, Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.1] by taking φ as in (1.1) with $w\equiv 1$ and Φ concave.

To prove Theorem 7.5, we need a good-λ inequality concerning the *non-tangential maximal function* and the *truncated Lusin-area function* associated with the heat semigroup. More precisely, let $\alpha\in(0,\,\infty)$ and $0<\epsilon<R<\infty$. For all $f\in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, the *truncated Lusin-area function* $S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\alpha}$, associated with the heat semigroup, is defined by setting,

$$
S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\alpha}(f)(x):=\left\{\int_{\Gamma_\alpha^{\epsilon,\,R}(x)}\left|t\nabla e^{-t^2L}(f)(y)\right|^2\frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}}\right\}^{\frac12}, \tag{7.22}
$$

where $\Gamma_\alpha^{\epsilon,\,R}(x):=\{(y,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times(\epsilon,\,R):\ |y-x|<\alpha t\}$. We have the following good-λ inequality.

Lemma 7.7. *Let φ and L be respectively as in Definition 2.2 and* (7.1)*. Assume that $\epsilon,\ R\in(0,\infty)$ with $\epsilon<R$. Then, there exist positive constants ϵ_0 and C, independent of ϵ and R, such that, for all $\gamma\in(0,\,1]$, $\lambda,\,s\in(0,\,\infty)$ and $f\in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\|\mathcal{N}_h(f)\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}<\infty$,*

$$
\varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)>2\lambda,\,\mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)\le\gamma\lambda\right\},\,s\right)
$$

$$\le C\gamma^{\epsilon_0}\varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{2}}(f)(x)>\lambda\right\},\,s\right).$$

Proof. Lemma 7.7 can be proved by using the same method as in the proof of [72, Lemma 3.3], where a good-λ inequality was established in the setting of the strongly Lipschitz domain of $\mathbb{R}^n$. In the present situation, the proof is more simple, since we do not need to take care of the boundary condition and the diameter of the domain. Here, in order to avoid redundancy, we only give an outline for the proof of Lemma 7.7. Let

$$O:=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)>\infty\}.$$

From the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of S_h, we deduce that $|O|<\infty$. By using Whitney's covering lemma, we see that there exists a family $\{Q_j\}_j$ of dyadic cubes, with the lengths $\{l_j\}_j$, satisfying that

(i) $O=\bigcup_j Q_j$ and $\{Q_j\}_j$ are disjoint;

(ii) $2Q_j\subset O$ and $4Q_j\cap O^{\complement}\neq\emptyset$.

By this, to show the desired conclusion of Lemma 7.7, we only need to prove that, for all j,

$$\varphi\left(\left\{x\in Q_j:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)>2\lambda,\,\mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)\le\gamma\lambda\right\},\,s\right)\lesssim\gamma^{\epsilon_0}\varphi\left(Q_j,\,s\right).\tag{7.23}$$

Moreover, for all $x\in Q_j$ and $x_j\in 4Q_j\cap O^{\complement}$, using the fact that $\Gamma_{\frac{1}{20}}^{\max\{10l_j,\,\epsilon\}}(x)\subset\Gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\max\{10l_j,\,\epsilon\}}(x_j)$ and the definition of O, we conclude that

$$S_h^{\max\{10l_j,\,\epsilon\},\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)\le\lambda.\tag{7.24}$$

Thus, if $\epsilon>10l_j$, we know that, for all $x\in Q_j$, $S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)\le\lambda$, which contracts with the condition $S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)>2\lambda$. This implies that $Q_j=\emptyset$. Hence, (7.23) holds in this case. If $\epsilon<10l_j$, from the fact that, for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)\le S_h^{\epsilon,\,10l_j,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)+S_h^{10l_j,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)$, (7.24) and Lemma 2.5(viii), we deduce that, to prove (7.23), it suffices to prove that, for all j,

$$\left|\left\{x\in Q_j\cap F:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)>\lambda\right\}\right|\lesssim\gamma^2|Q_j|,\tag{7.25}$$

where $F:=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ \mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)\le\gamma\lambda\}$. We prove (7.25) by dividing two cases. If $\epsilon\ge 5l_j$, then similar to the proof of [72, Lemma 3.4] (replace the strong Lipschitz domain Ω and the non-tangential maximal function therein respectively by $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the present version of the non-tangential maximal function in (7.4)), we conclude that, for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)\lesssim\mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)$, which, combining with the definition of F, shows that

$$\int_{Q_j\cap F}\left[S_h^{\epsilon,\,10l_j,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)\right]^2\,dx\lesssim\int_{Q_j\cap F}\left[\mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)\right]^2\,dx\lesssim(\gamma\lambda)^2|Q_j|.$$

This, together with Chebyshev's inequality, implies the validity of (7.25). For the case when $\epsilon < 5l_j$, let $G := \{(y,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (\epsilon, 10l_j) : \ d(y, Q_j \cap F) < \frac{t}{20}\}$. From (7.22) and Fubini's theorem, we infer that

$$\int_{Q_j \cap F} \left[S_h^{\epsilon,\, 10l_j,\, \frac{1}{20}}(f)(x) \right]^2 dx = \iint_G t \left| \nabla u(y,t) \right|^2 dy\, dt,$$

where $u(y,t) := e^{-t^2 L}(f)(y)$. To estimate $\int_G t|\nabla u(y,t)|^2\, dy\, dt$, we need to introduce some smooth cut-off function defined on a fatter truncated cone. More precisely, let

$$G_1 := \left\{ (y,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}, 20l_j \right) : \ d(y, Q_j \cap F) < \frac{t}{10} \right\}$$

and $\eta \in C_0^\infty(G_1)$ satisfying $\eta \equiv 1$ on G, $0 \le \eta \le 1$ and $\|\nabla \eta\|_{L^\infty(G_1)} \lesssim \frac{1}{t}$ (see also the proof of [40, Lemma 5.4]). Then, by the ellipticity condition, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G t \left| \nabla u(y,t) \right|^2 dy\, dt &\le \int_{G_1} t \left| \nabla u(y,t) \right|^2 \eta(y,t)\, dy\, dt \\ &\lesssim \Re e \int_{G_1} tA(y) \nabla u(y,t) \overline{\nabla u(y,t)} \eta(y,t)\, dy\, dt =: \Re e \mathrm{I}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Leibniz's rule, the definition of L and the fact that $\partial_t u(y,\, t) = -2tLu(y,\, t)$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{I} &= \int_{G_1} tA(y) \nabla u(y,t) \overline{\nabla(\eta u)(y,t)}\, dy\, dt - \int_{G_1} tA(y) \nabla u(y,t) \overline{u(y,t) \nabla \eta(y,t)}\, dy\, dt \\ &= \int_{G_1} tLu(y,t) \overline{(\eta u)(y,t)}\, dy\, dt - \int_{G_1} tA(y) \nabla u(y,t) \overline{u(y,t) \nabla \eta(y,t)}\, dy\, dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{G_1} \partial_t u(y,t) \overline{(\eta u)(y,t)}\, dy\, dt - \int_{G_1} tA(y) \nabla u(y,t) \overline{u(y,t) \nabla \eta(y,t)}\, dy\, dt \\ &=: -\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{I}_1 - \mathrm{J}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from the fact that $\partial_t(|u(y,t)|^2) = 2\Re e(\partial_t u(y,t)) \overline{u(y,t)}$, the integral by parts and $\eta \in C_0^\infty(G_1)$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \Re e \mathrm{I} &= -\Re e \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{I}_1 - \Re e \mathrm{J} \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} \int_{G_1} \partial_t \left(|u(y,t)|^2 \right) \eta(y,t)\, dy\, dt - \Re e \int_{G_1} tA(y) \nabla u(y,t) \overline{u(y,t) \nabla \eta(y,t)}\, dy\, dt \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_{G_1 \setminus G} |u(y,t)|^2 \partial_t \eta(y,t)\, dy\, dt - \Re e \int_{G_1 \setminus G} tA(y) \nabla u(y,t) \overline{u(y,t) \nabla \eta(y,t)}\, dy\, dt \\ &=: \mathrm{I}_2 + \mathrm{I}_3. \end{aligned}$$

The remaining estimates for I_2 and I_3 are obtained by using a decomposition of the set $G_1 \setminus G$, the properties of the cut-off function η, Besicovith's covering lemma and a Caccioppoli's inequality (see, for example, [72, (3.29)-(3.33)] for the detail calculations). We then conclude that $\mathrm{I}_2 + \mathrm{I}_3 \lesssim (\gamma\lambda)^2 |Q_k|$. This, together with an application of Chebyshev's inequality, implies the validity of (7.25), which completes the proof of Lemma 7.7. □

With the help of Lemma 7.7, we now prove Theorem 7.5.

Proof of Theorem 7.5. We first prove the following equivalence relationships

$$H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) = H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) = H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

The proof is divided into the following three steps.

Step 1. $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $f\in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For any $0<\epsilon<R<\infty$ and $\gamma\in(0,1]$, by Lemma 2.4(ii), Fubini's theorem and Lemma 7.7, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\, S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)\right)dx\\
&\quad\sim\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)>t\right\},\, t\right)\frac{dt}{t}\\
&\quad\sim\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)>t,\, \mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)\le\gamma t\right\},\, t\right)\frac{dt}{t}\\
&\qquad+\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ \mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)>\gamma t\right\},\, t\right)\frac{dt}{t}\\
&\quad\lesssim\gamma^{\epsilon_0}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{2}}(f)(x)>\frac{t}{2}\right\},\, t\right)\frac{dt}{t}\\
&\qquad+\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ \mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)>\gamma t\right\},\, t\right)\frac{dt}{t}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the change of variables and the fact that φ is of uniformly upper type 1, we further see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\, S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{20}}(f)(x)\right)dx\\
&\quad\lesssim\gamma^{\epsilon_0}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{2}}(f)(x)>t\right\},\, t\right)\frac{dt}{t}\\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{\gamma}\int_0^\infty \varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ \mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)>t\right\},\, t\right)\frac{dt}{t}\\
&\quad\lesssim\gamma^{\epsilon_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\, S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\frac{1}{2}}(f)(x)\right)dx+\frac{1}{\gamma}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\,\mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)\right)dx.
\end{aligned}\tag{7.26}$$

Moreover, using an argument similar to that used in the proof of [74, Lemma 7.7], we conclude that, for all $0<\alpha<\beta<\infty$ and $s\in(0,\infty)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x, S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\alpha}(f)(x)\right)dx\sim\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x, S_h^{\epsilon,\,R,\,\beta}(f)(x)\right)dx.$$

From this and (7.26) with γ sufficient small, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\, S_h^{\epsilon,\,R}(f)(x)\right)dx\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\,\mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)\right)dx.$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ and $R \to \infty$, we immediately know that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(x,\, S_h(f)(x)\right)\, dx \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(x,\, \mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)\right)\, dx,$$

which implies that $\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,S_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. Thus, $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Step 2. $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By their definitions (see (7.2) and (7.3)), we see that $\mathcal{N}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}(f) \le \mathcal{R}_h(f)$. Moreover, similar to [46, Lemma 5.3], we conclude that, for any $0 < \alpha < \beta < \infty$,

$$\|\mathcal{N}_h^{\alpha}(f)\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \sim \left\|\mathcal{N}_h^{\beta}(f)\right\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

which immediately implies that

$$\|\mathcal{N}_h(f)\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \sim \left\|\mathcal{N}_h^{\frac{1}{2}}(f)\right\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|\mathcal{R}_h(f)\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

This establishes the inclusion $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Step 3. $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By Theorem 4.9 and Lemma 5.7, it suffices to prove that, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule α associated with the ball B,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(x,\, \mathcal{R}_h(\lambda\alpha)(x)\right)\, dx \lesssim \varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right), \tag{7.27}$$

where $\epsilon \in (0,\infty)$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ can be chosen sufficient large. The estimate (7.27) can be proved by using Assumption (B); see, for example, the proof of (4.8). We omit the details.

From Steps 1 though 3, we deduce that

$$L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

with equivalent quasi-norms, which, together with the fact that

$$L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

are, respectively, dense in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and a density argument, then implies that the spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi,\,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms The proof for the equivalence relationships that $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n) = H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n) = H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is similar, we omit the details here. This finishes the proof of Theorem 7.5. □

7.2 Boundedness of the Riesz transform $\nabla L^{-1/2}$

In this subsection, we study the boundedness of the Riesz transform $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ associated with L on $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $i(\varphi) \in (\frac{n}{n+1}, 1]$, and the associated weak boundedness at the endpoint $i(\varphi) = \frac{n}{n+1}$. Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 7.8. *Let φ and L be respectively as in Definition 2.2 and* (7.1)*. Let $I(\varphi)$, $i(\varphi)$, $q(\varphi)$ and $r(\varphi)$ be, respectively, as in* (2.4)*,* (2.5)*,* (2.6) *and* (2.7)*.*

(i) *If $r(\varphi) > (\frac{\min\{p_+(L),\, q_+(L)\}}{I(\varphi)})'$, then $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

(ii) *If $i(\varphi) \in (\frac{n}{n+1}, 1]$, $q(\varphi) < \frac{ni(\varphi)}{n+1}$ and $r(\varphi) > (\frac{\min\{p_+(L),\, q_+(L)\}}{q(\varphi)})'$, then $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $H_{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

To prove Theorem 7.8, we need a new molecular characterization of the classical Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Similar to [42, Theorem 4.11], we have the following molecular characterization of $H_{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proposition 7.9. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2 and $q \in (1, \infty)$. Assume that $s \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $s \ge \lfloor n[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - 1]\rfloor$, $\epsilon \in (\max\{n+s,\, n\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)}\} - \frac{n}{q}, \infty)$, $q(\varphi) \in [1, q)$ and $r(\varphi) > \frac{q}{q-q(\varphi)}$, where $i(\varphi)$, $q(\varphi)$ and $r(\varphi)$ are respectively as in* (2.5)*,* (2.6) *and* (2.7)*. Then, $H^{q,\,s,\,\epsilon}_{\varphi,\,\mathrm{mol}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.*

The proof of Proposition 7.9 is similar to that of [42, Theorem 4.11]. We omit the details here. Observe that, in [42, Theorem 4.11], the ranges of the exponents may be different from those of Proposition 7.9. More precisely, in [42, Theorem 4.11], the authors want to relax the range of the Musielak-Orlicz function φ, by narrowing the range of the exponent q. However, in the present case, we need more wider range of q.

Proof of Theorem 7.8. The proof of (i) depends on Theorem 4.8 and Lemma 5.7. We only need to show that, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule α (with M and ϵ large enough) associated with the ball B,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(x,\, \nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)(x)\right)\, dx \lesssim \varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right). \tag{7.28}$$

Using the $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ for all $q \in (p_-(L),\, q_+(L))$ and the following off-diagonal estimates that

$$\left\|\nabla L^{-1/2}\left(I - e^{-tL}\right)^M f\right\|_{L^q(F)} \lesssim \left\{\frac{t}{[d(E,\, F)]^2}\right\}^M \|f\|_{L^q(E)}$$

and

$$\left\|\nabla L^{-1/2}\left(tLe^{-tL}\right)^M f\right\|_{L^q(F)} \lesssim \left\{\frac{t}{[d(E,\, F)]^2}\right\}^M \|f\|_{L^q(E)}$$

for closed sets E, $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $d(E, F) > 0$, we conclude (7.28) by using the same method as in (5.7). This shows (i).

To prove (ii), let $q \in (p_-(L),\, p_+(L))$. For any $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule α associated with B, similar to [74, (7.34)], we infer that there exists a large enough positive constant ϵ_0 such that, for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\left\|\nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha)\right\|_{L^q(S_j(B))} \lesssim 2^{-j\epsilon_0}|B|^{\frac{1}{q}}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{7.29}$$

Moreover, since $1 \le q(\varphi) < \frac{n}{n+1} i(\varphi)$, we know $s := \lfloor n[\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} - 1]\rfloor = 0$, which, together with the fact that (see, for example, the proof of [46, Theorem 7.4] when φ is an Orlicz function)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha)(x)\,dx = 0,$$

immediately implies that, for each $(\varphi,\, q,\, M,\, \epsilon)_L$-molecule m associated with the ball B, $\nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha)$ is a $(\varphi,\, q,\, 0,\, \epsilon)$-molecule associated with the same ball B. This, together with the assumptions $q(\varphi) < \frac{n}{n+1} i(\varphi)$, $r(\varphi) > (\frac{\min\{p_+(L),\, q_+(L)\}}{q(\varphi)})'$ and Proposition 7.9, implies that $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which completes the proof of (ii) and hence Theorem 7.8. □

Now, we establish the weak boundedness of $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ at the endpoint $i(\varphi) = \frac{n}{n+1}$. Before stating our conclusions, we first recall some necessary definitions.

Definition 7.10. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2, $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\operatorname{supp}\psi \subset B(0,\,1)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x)\,dx = 1$. The *weak Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space* $WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined to be the set $\{f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^n) :\ \|f\|_{WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|f\|_{WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\\
&\quad := \left\| \sup_{t\in(0,\,\infty)} \psi_t * f \right\|_{WL^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\\
&\quad := \inf\left\{\lambda \in (0,\,\infty) :\ \sup_{\eta\in(0,\,\infty)} \varphi\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n :\ \sup_{t\in(0,\,\infty)} |(\psi_t * f)(x)| > \eta\right\},\, \frac{\eta}{\lambda}\right) \le 1\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

and, for all $t \in (0,\,\infty)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\psi_t(x) := t^{-n}\psi(\frac{x}{t})$.

Theorem 7.11. *Let φ and L be respectively as in Definition 2.2 and* (7.1)*. Assume that $i(\varphi)$, $I(\varphi)$, $q(\varphi)$ and $r(\varphi)$ are respectively as in* (2.5), (2.4), (2.6) *and* (2.7)*. If $i(\varphi) = \frac{n}{n+1}$ is attainable, $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $I(\varphi) \in (0,\,1)$ and $r(\varphi) > (\frac{\min\{p_+(L),\, q_+(L)\}}{q(\varphi)})'$, then $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Remark 7.12. Theorem 7.8 completely covers [46, Theorems 7.1 and 7.4] by taking φ as in (1.1) with $w \equiv 1$ and Φ concave. Theorem 7.11 completely covers [19, Theorem 1.2] by taking $\varphi(x,t) := t^{n/(n+1)}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in [0,\infty)$.

To prove Theorem 7.11, we need the following superposition principle of weak type estimates.

Lemma 7.13. *Let φ be as in Definition 2.2 satisfying $I(\varphi) \in (0,\,1)$, where $I(\varphi)$ is as in* (2.4)*. Assume that $\{a_j\}_j$ is a sequence of measurable functions and $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that there exists a sequence $\{B_j\}_j$ of balls, it holds that*

$$\sum_j \varphi\left(B_j,\, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right) < \infty.$$

Moreover, if there exists a positive constant C such that, for all $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\varphi\left(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n:\ |\lambda_j a_j(x)| > \eta\}, \eta\right) \le C\varphi\left(B, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right). \tag{7.30}$$

Then, there exists a positive constant $\widetilde{C}$ such that, for all $\eta \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\varphi\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n:\ \sum_j |\lambda_j||a_j(x)| > \eta\right\}, \eta\right) \le \widetilde{C}\sum_j \varphi\left(B_j, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right).$$

Proof. For any given $\eta \in (0,\infty)$, let $E := \cup_j\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n:\ |\lambda_j||a_j(x)| > \eta\}$. From (7.30), we deduce that

$$\varphi(E, \eta) \lesssim \sum_j \varphi\left(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n:\ |\lambda_j||a_j(x)| > \eta\}, \eta\right) \lesssim \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right), \tag{7.31}$$

which is desired. On the other hand, taking $p_1 \in (I(\varphi), 1)$, then we know that φ is of uniformly upper type p_1. This, together with Chebyshev's inequality and (7.30), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi\left(\left\{E^{\complement}:\ \sum_j |\lambda_j||a_j(x)| > \eta\right\}, \eta\right) &\lesssim \frac{1}{\eta}\sum_j \int_{\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ |\lambda_j||a_j(x)|\le\eta\}} |\lambda_j a_j(x)|\varphi(x, \eta)\,dx\\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\eta}\sum_j \int_0^\eta \varphi(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n:\ |\lambda_j||a_j(x)| > \eta\}, \eta)\,dt\\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\eta}\int_0^\eta \left(\frac{\eta}{t}\right)^{p_1} dt \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\\ &\lesssim \sum_j \varphi\left(B_j, \frac{|\lambda_j|}{\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (7.31), implies the desired estimates and hence completes the proof of Lemma 7.13. □

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 7.11.

Proof of Theorem 7.11. To prove this theorem, let $q \in (p_-(L), \min\{p_+(L), q_+(L)\})$. We first claim that it suffices to show that, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and each $(\varphi, q, \epsilon, M)_L$-molecules α associated with the ball B (with ϵ and M large enough) and all $\eta \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\varphi\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n:\ \sup_{t>0}\left|\left(\psi_t * \left(\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)\right)(x)\right)\right| > \eta\right\}, \eta\right) \lesssim \varphi\left(B, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right). \tag{7.32}$$

Indeed, if (7.32) holds true, then for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap H_{\varphi, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, by Theorem 4.8, we know that, there exist a sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $\{\alpha_j\}_j$ of $(\varphi, q, M, \epsilon)_L$-molecules associated with the balls $\{B_j\}_j$ such that $f = \sum_j \lambda_j\alpha_j$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\|f\|_{H_{\varphi, L}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \sim$

$\Lambda(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j)$. Moreover, by the assumption that $I(\varphi)<1$, the change of variable and Lemma 7.13, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\nabla L^{-1/2}(f)\right\|_{WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\\
&\quad=\inf\left\{\lambda\in(0,\infty):\vphantom{\sum}\right.\\
&\qquad\left.\sup_{\eta\in(0,\infty)}\varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ \sup_{t\in(0,\infty)}\left|\left(\psi_t*\left[\sum_j\lambda_j\nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha_j)\right]\right)(x)\right|>\eta\right\},\frac{\eta}{\lambda}\right)\le 1\right\}\\
&\quad=\inf\left\{\lambda\in(0,\infty):\vphantom{\sum}\right.\\
&\qquad\left.\sup_{\widetilde{\eta}\in(0,\infty)}\varphi\left(\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n:\ \sup_{t\in(0,\infty)}\left|\left(\psi_t*\left[\sum_j\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda}\nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha_j)\right]\right)(x)\right|>\widetilde{\eta}\right\},\widetilde{\eta}\right)\le 1\right\}\\
&\quad\lesssim\inf\left\{\lambda\in(0,\infty):\ \sum_j\varphi\left(B_j,\frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda\|\chi_{B_j}\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\le 1\right\}\sim\Lambda\left(\{\lambda_j\alpha_j\}_j\right)\sim\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)},
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with a density argument, implies that $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This shows the claim.

Now, we turn to the proof of (7.32). Let $p_1\in[I(\varphi),1)$ be a uniformly upper type of φ. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi\left(\left\{x\in 16B:\ \sup_{t\in(0,\infty)}\left|\left(\psi_t*\left[\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)\right]\right)(x)\right|>\eta\right\},\eta\right)\\
&\quad\lesssim\int_{16B}\varphi\left(x,\sup_{t\in(0,\infty)}\left|\left(\psi_t*\left[\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)\right]\right)(x)\right|\right)dx\\
&\quad\lesssim\int_{16B}\left\{1+\left[\sup_{t\in(0,\infty)}\left|\left(\psi_t*\left[\nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha)\right]\right)(x)\right|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right]^{p_1}\right\}\\
&\qquad\times\varphi\left(x,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)dx\\
&\quad\lesssim\int_{16B}\varphi\left(x,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)dx\\
&\qquad+\int_{16B}\left\{\sup_{t\in(0,\infty)}\left|\left(\psi_t*\left[\nabla L^{-1/2}\alpha\right]\right)(x)\right|\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right\}^{p_1}\varphi\left(x,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)dx\\
&\quad=:\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{B}.
\end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we may only estimate $\mathcal{B}$, the estimate for $\mathcal{A}$ being similar and simpler. Let $q\ge 2$ and q be as in (7.16) such that (5.8) holds true. Let $\widetilde{q}\in(q(\varphi),\infty)$.

Then $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap\mathbb{A}_{\widetilde{q}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, from [4, Theorem 4.2], we know that $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded on $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which, together with Hölder's inequality and the $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function $\mathcal{M}$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B} &\lesssim \|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\left\{\int_{16B}\left[\mathcal{M}\left(\nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha)\right)(x)\right]^q\,dx\right\}^{\frac{p_1}{q}}\\ &\quad\times\left\{\frac{1}{|16B|}\int_{16B}\left[\varphi\left(x,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\right]^{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}\,dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}}|B|^{\frac{1}{(\frac{q}{p_1})'}}\\ &\lesssim \|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\left\{\int_{16B}[\alpha(x)]^q\,dx\right\}^{\frac{p_1}{q}}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)|B|^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}.\end{aligned}$$

Using Definition 4.3, we further see that $\mathcal{B}\lesssim\varphi(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}})$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi\left(\left\{x\in 16B:\ \sup_{t\in(0,\,\infty)}\left|\left(\psi_t*\left[\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)\right]\right)(x)\right|>\eta\right\},\,\eta\right)\\ &\quad\lesssim\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{7.33}$$

Now, we turn to the case that $x\in(16B)^\complement$. For all $i\in\{5,\,6,\,\ldots\}$, let

$$\mathrm{I}_i:=\varphi\left(\left\{x\in S_i(B):\ \sup_{t\in(0,\,r_B)}\left|\psi_t*\left[\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)\right](x)\right|>\frac{\eta}{2}\right\},\,\eta\right)$$

and

$$\mathrm{J}:=\varphi\left(\left\{x\in(16B)^\complement:\ \sup_{t\in[r_B,\,\infty)}\left|\psi_t*\left(\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)\right)(x)\right|>\frac{\eta}{2}\right\},\,\eta\right).$$

Assume that $\widetilde{S}_i(B):=2^{i+1}B\setminus 2^{i-2}B$ and $\widetilde{\widetilde{S}}_i(B):=2^{i+2}B\setminus 2^{i-3}B$. It is easy to see that, for all $x\in S_i(B)$, $t\in(0,\,r_B)$ and $|y-x|<t$, it holds that $y\in\widetilde{S}_i(B)$. Thus, similar to the estimate for $\mathcal{B}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I}_i&\lesssim\varphi\left(S_i(B),\,\mathcal{M}\left(\chi_{\widetilde{S}_i(B)}\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)\right)(x)\right)\\ &\lesssim\left\{\int_{\widetilde{S}_i(B)}\left|\nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha)(x)\right|^q\,dx\right\}^{\frac{p_1}{q}}\left|2^iB\right|^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}\|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\varphi\left(2^iB,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (7.29), further implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I}_i&\lesssim 2^{-i\epsilon_0p_1}|B|^{\frac{p_1}{q}}\|\chi_B\|^{-p_1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\left|2^iB\right|^{-\frac{p_1}{q}}\|\chi_B\|^{p_1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\varphi\left(2^iB,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\\ &\lesssim 2^{-i[\epsilon_0p_1+\frac{p_1n}{q}-n\widetilde{q}]}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_0 \in (0,\infty)$ is a sufficiently large constant. Thus, we conclude that

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{I}_i \lesssim \varphi\left(B,\, \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right). \tag{7.34}$$

We now estimate J. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$F_i(x) := \sup_{t\in[r_B,\,\infty)} \left|\int_{S_i(B)} \frac{1}{t^n}\left[\psi\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{x-x_B}{t}\right)\right] \nabla L^{-1/2}\left(\lambda\alpha\right)(y)\,dy\right|.$$

For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $y \in S_i(B)$, $t \in [2^{j-1}r_B,\, 2^j r_B)$, $|x-y| < t$ or $|x-x_B| < t$, we have $|x-x_B| \le |x-y| + |y-x_B| < (2^i+2^j)r_B$. Thus, $x \in (2^i+2^j)B$. This, together with the mean value theorem, Hölder's inequality and (7.29), implies that, there exists a sufficiently large constant $\widetilde{\epsilon}_0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
F_i(x) &\lesssim \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{t\in[2^{j-1}r_B,\,2^j r_B)} \chi_{(2^i+2^j)B}(x) \int_{S_i(B)} \frac{1}{t^n}\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \frac{|y-x_B|}{t} \\
&\quad \times \left|\nabla L^{-1/2}\left(\lambda\alpha\right)(y)\right| dy \\
&\lesssim |\lambda| \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{t\in[2^{j-1}r_B,\,2^j r_B)} \chi_{(2^i+2^j)B}(x) \frac{2^i r_B}{(2^j r_B)^{n+1}} \left|2^i B\right|^{\frac{1}{q'}} \left\|\nabla L^{-1/2}(\alpha)\right\|_{L^q(S_i(B))} \\
&\lesssim |\lambda| \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{t\in[2^{j-1}r_B,\,2^j r_B)} \chi_{(2^i+2^j)B}(x) 2^{-j(n+1)} 2^{-i\widetilde{\epsilon}_0} \|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\
&=: C_0|\lambda| \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{t\in[2^{j-1}r_B,\,2^j r_B)} \chi_{(2^i+2^j)B}(x) 2^{-j(n+1)} 2^{-i\widetilde{\epsilon}_0} \|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)},
\end{aligned}$$

where C_0 is a positive constant independent of i and x. Let

$$j_0 := \max\left\{j \in \mathbb{N}:\ C_0|\lambda| 2^{-j(n+1)} 2^{-i\widetilde{\epsilon}_0} \|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} > \frac{\eta}{2}\right\}.$$

We know that, for all $x \in \left[\left(2^i + 2^{j_0}\right)B\right]^{\complement}$,

$$F_i(x) \le C_0|\lambda| 2^{-j(n+1)} 2^{-i\widetilde{\epsilon}_0} \|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} \le \frac{\eta}{2},$$

which immediately implies that

$$\left\{x \in (16B)^{\complement}:\ |F_i(x)| > \frac{\eta}{2}\right\} \subset \left(2^i + 2^{j_0}\right)B.$$

Thus, from the assumption that $i(\varphi)$ is attainable and $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi\left(\left\{x \in (16B)^{\complement}:\ F_i(x) > \frac{\eta}{2}\right\},\, \eta\right) \\
&\quad \lesssim \varphi\left(\left(2^i + 2^{j_0}\right)B,\, 2^{-j_0(n+1)} 2^{-i\widetilde{\epsilon}_0} \frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim 2^{-j_0(n+1)i(\varphi)}2^{-i\widetilde{\epsilon}_0 i(\varphi)}\left(2^i+2^{j_0}\right)^n\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\\
&\lesssim 2^{-j_0[(n+1)i(\varphi)-n]}2^{-i\widetilde{\epsilon}_0 i(\varphi)-n}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with $i(\varphi)=\frac{n}{n+1}$, implies that

$$\varphi\left(\left\{x\in(16B)^{\complement}:\ F_i(x)>\frac{\eta}{2}\right\},\,\eta\right)\lesssim 2^{-i(\widetilde{\epsilon}_0 i(\varphi)-n)}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right).$$

By this, together with Proposition 7.9 and the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda)(x)\,dx=0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{J}&\lesssim\varphi\left(\left\{x\in(16B)^{\complement}:\ \sum_{i=5}^{\infty}\sup_{t\in[r_B,\infty)}\left|\int_{S_i(B)}\frac{1}{t^n}\left[\psi\left(\frac{x-y}{t}\right)-\psi\left(\frac{x-x_B}{t}\right)\right]\right.\right.\right.\\
&\quad\left.\left.\left.\times\nabla L^{-1/2}(\lambda\alpha)(y)\right|>\eta\right\},\,\eta\right)\\
&\lesssim\sum_{i=5}^{\infty}2^{-i(\widetilde{\epsilon}_0 i(\varphi)-n)}\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right)\sim\varphi\left(B,\,\frac{|\lambda|}{\|\chi_B\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This, combined with (7.33) and (7.34), implies that (7.32) holds true, which completes the proof of Theorem 7.11. □

8 The Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space associated with the Schrödinger operator

In this section, we establish several equivalent characterizations of the Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated with the Schrödinger operator $L:=-\Delta+V$, where $0\le V\in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, in terms of the Lusin-area function associated with the Poisson semigroup of L, the non-tangential and the radial maximal functions associated with the heat semigroup generated by L, and the non-tangential and the radial maximal functions associated with the Poisson semigroup generated by L. Moreover, we also consider the boundedness of the associated Riesz transform on $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Let

$$L:=-\Delta+V \tag{8.1}$$

be a Schrödinger operator, where $0\le V\in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since V is a nonnegative function, from the Feynman-Kac formula, we deduce that the kernel of the semigroup e^{-tL}, h_t, satisfies that, for all $t\in(0,\infty)$ and $x,\ y\in\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$0\le h_t(x,y)\le(4\pi t)^{-n/2}\exp\left\{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4t}\right\}.$$

Thus, L satisfies Assumptions (A) and (B) with $k = 1$, $p_L = 1$ and $q_L = \infty$. Moreover, L satisfies Assumptions (H_1) and (H_2) as in Section 5.

For all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define the *Lusin-area function* S_P associated with the Poisson semigroup of L by

$$S_P(f)(x) := \left\{ \iint_{\Gamma(x)} \left| t\sqrt{L} e^{-t\sqrt{L}} f(y) \right|^2 \frac{dy\,dt}{t^{n+1}} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Similar to Definition 4.1, we introduce the space $H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as follows.

Definition 8.1. Let φ be as in Definition 2.2 and L as in (8.1). A function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is said to be in $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if $S_P(f) \in L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$; moreover, define

$$\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \|S_P(f)\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \inf\left\{ \lambda \in (0,\infty) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi\left(x, \frac{S_P(f)(x)}{\lambda}\right) dx \le 1 \right\}.$$

The *S_P-adapted Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space* $H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined to be the completion of $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with respect to the *quasi-norm* $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

For any $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$\mathcal{N}_h(f)(x) := \sup_{y \in B(x,t),\, t \in (0,\infty)} \left| e^{-t^2 L}(f)(y) \right|, \quad \mathcal{N}_P(f)(x) := \sup_{y \in B(x,t),\, t \in (0,\infty)} \left| e^{-t\sqrt{L}}(f)(y) \right|,$$

$$\mathcal{R}_h(f)(x) := \sup_{t \in (0,\infty)} |e^{-t^2 L}(f)(x)| \text{ and } \mathcal{R}_P(f)(x) := \sup_{t \in (0,\infty)} |e^{-t\sqrt{L}}(f)(x)|.$$

Definition 8.2. Let L and φ be as in (8.1) and Definition 2.2, respectively. A function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is said to be in $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if $\mathcal{N}_h(f) \in L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$; moreover, let $\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \|\mathcal{N}_h(f)\|_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. The *$\mathcal{N}_h$-adapted Musielak-Orlicz-Hardy space* $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined to be the completion of $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with respect to the *quasi-norm* $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$.

The *spaces* $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are respectively defined in a similar way.

Now, we give the following equivalent characterizations of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in terms of maximal functions associated with L.

Theorem 8.3. *Assume that φ and L are as in Definition 8.2. Then*

$$H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)\ H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

coincide with equivalent quasi-norms.

Remark 8.4. Theorem 8.3 generalizes [74, Theorem 7.4] by extending the range of the considered weights. More precisely, The radial and non-tangential maximal function characterizations of $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ were obtained in [74, Theorem 7.4] under the assumption $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{2/[2-I(\varphi)]}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. However, in the above Theorem 8.3, the assumption $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{2/[2-I(\varphi)]}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is not needed.

Proof of Theorem 8.3. The proof of Theorem 8.3 is divided into the following six steps.

Step 1. $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let M and q be as in Theorem 5.4. By the proof of Theorem 5.4, we know that $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms. Thus, we only need to prove $\widetilde{H}^{M,\,q}_{\varphi,\,L,\,\mathrm{at}}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. To this end, similar to the proof of (5.7), it suffices to show that, for any $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$ and $(\varphi,\,q,\,M)_L$-atom α associated to the ball B,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\varphi\left(x,\mathcal{N}_h(\lambda\alpha)(x)\right)\,dx\lesssim\varphi\left(B,|\lambda|\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right).$$

From the $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of $\mathcal{N}_h$, similar to the proof of (5.7), it follows that the above estimate holds true. We omit the details here.

Step 2. $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which is deduced from the fact that, for all $f\in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathcal{R}_h(f)(x)\le\mathcal{N}_h(f)(x)$.

Step 3. $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, whose proof is similar to that of Step 3 in the proof of [74, Theorem 7.4]. We omit the details here.

Step 4. $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, whose proof is similar to that of Step 4 in the proof of [74, Theorem 7.4], and hence we omit the details here.

Step 5. $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, whose proof is similar to that of [74, Proposition 7.6]. We omit the details here.

Step 6. $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Let $f\in\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $t\sqrt{L}e^{-t\sqrt{L}}f\in T_{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$, which, together with Proposition 4.5(ii), implies that $\pi_{L,\,M}(t\sqrt{L}e^{-t\sqrt{L}}f)\in H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Furthermore, from the H_∞ functional calculus, we infer that

$$f=\frac{\widetilde{C}_{(M)}}{C_{(M)}}\pi_{L,\,M}(t\sqrt{L}e^{-t\sqrt{L}}f)$$

in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\widetilde{C}_{(M)}$ is a positive constant such that $\widetilde{C}_{(M)}\int_0^\infty t^{2(M+1)}e^{-t^2}te^{-t}\,\frac{dt}{t}=1$ and $C_{(M)}$ is as in (4.3). This, combined with $\pi_{L,\,M}(t\sqrt{L}e^{-t\sqrt{L}}f)\in H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, implies that $f\in H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore, we know that $\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

From Steps 1 though 6, we deduce that

$$\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)\text{ and }\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

coincide with equivalent quasi-norms, which, together with the fact that

$$\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n),\ \widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)\text{ and }\widetilde{H}_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

are, respectively, dense in $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and a density argument, then implies that the spaces $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_h}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{R}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $H_{\varphi,\mathcal{N}_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H_{\varphi,\,S_P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ coincide with equivalent quasi-norms, which completes the proof of Theorem 8.3. ☐

From now on, we study the boundedness of $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ on $H_{\varphi,\,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Similar to Theorem 7.8, we have the following conclusions.

Theorem 8.5. *Let φ and L be as in Definition 2.2 and (8.1), respectively. Assume that $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded on $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $r \in (1, p_0)$ with some $p_0 \in (2, \infty)$. Let $i(\varphi)$, $q(\varphi)$ and $r(\varphi)$ be, respectively, as in (2.5), (2.6) and (2.7).*

(i) *If $r(\varphi) > (p_0/I(\varphi))'$, then $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ into $L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

(ii) *If $i(\varphi) \in (\frac{n}{n+1}, 1]$, $\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)} \in (1, \frac{n+1}{n})$ and $r(\varphi) > (p_0/q(\varphi))'$, then $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ into $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 8.5(i) is similar to that of Theorem 7.8(i). We omit the details here. Now we prove (ii). Let $f \in H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)})$. Then there exist $p_2 \in (0, i(\varphi))$ and $q_0 \in (q(\varphi), \infty)$ such that $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q_0}{p_2})$, φ is of uniformly lower type p_2 and $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{q_0}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, by Proposition 5.4, we know that there exist $\{\lambda_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a sequence $\{a_j\}_j$ of $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-atoms such that $f = \sum_j \lambda_j a_j$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \sim \|f\|_{H^{M,q}_{\varphi,\mathrm{at}}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. Moreover, we know that $\nabla L^{-1/2}(f) = \sum_j \lambda_j \nabla L^{-1/2}(a_j)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Let a be a $(\varphi,\, q,\, M)_L$-atom associated with the ball B. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $\chi_i := \chi_{S_i(B)}$, $\widetilde{\chi}_i := |S_i(B)|^{-1}\chi_i$, $m_i := \int_{S_i(B)} \nabla L^{-1/2}(a)(x)\,dx$ and $M_i := \nabla L^{-1/2}(a)\chi_i - m_i\widetilde{\chi}_i$. Then we have

$$\nabla L^{-1/2}(a) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} M_i + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} m_i\widetilde{\chi}_i. \tag{8.2}$$

For $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $N_j := \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} m_i$. By an argument similar to that used in the proof of [45, Theorem 6.3], we know that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \nabla L^{-1/2}(a)(x)\,dx = 0$, which, together with (8.2), yields

$$\nabla L^{-1/2}(a) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} M_i + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} N_{i+1}\left(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_i\right).$$

Obviously, for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\operatorname{supp} M_i \subset 2^{i+1}B \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} M_i(x)\,dx = 0. \tag{8.3}$$

When $i \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$, by Hölder's inequality and the $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$-boundedness of $\nabla L^{-1/2}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\|M_i\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\le \left\{\int_{S_i(B)} |\nabla L^{-1/2}a(x)|^q\,dx\right\}^{1/q} + \left\{\int_{S_i(B)} |m_i\widetilde{\chi}_i(x)|^q\,dx\right\}^{1/q}\\ &\lesssim \|a\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim |B|^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}.\end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

Moreover, similar to (7.29), we know that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i \ge 5$,

$$\|M_i\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \left\|\nabla L^{-1/2}a\right\|_{L^q(S_i(B))} \lesssim 2^{-2Mi}|B|^{1/q}\|\chi_B\|^{-1}_{L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{8.5}$$

Furthermore, by $\varphi \in \mathbb{RH}_{(p_0/q(\varphi))'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we see that there exist $q \in (2, p_0)$ and $\widetilde{q} \in (q(\varphi), \infty)$ such that $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{\widetilde{q}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathbb{RH}_{(q/\widetilde{q})'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. From this, Hölder's inequality, (8.4) and (8.5), it follows that, for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[\varphi(2^{i+1}B, t)\right]^{-1} \int_{2^{i+1}B} |M_i(x)|^{\widetilde{q}} \varphi(x,t)\,dx\\
&\quad\le \left[\varphi(2^{i+1}B, t)\right]^{-1} \left\{\int_{2^{i+1}B} |M_i(x)|^q\,dx\right\}^{\frac{\widetilde{q}}{q}} \left\{\int_{2^{i+1}B} [\varphi(x,t)]^{(\frac{q}{\widetilde{q}})'}\,dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{(q/\widetilde{q})'}}\\
&\quad\lesssim 2^{-2\widetilde{q}iM} |B|^{\frac{\widetilde{q}}{q}} \|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-\widetilde{q}} |2^{k+1}B|^{-\frac{\widetilde{q}}{q}},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\|M_i\|_{L^{\widetilde{q}}_{\varphi}(2^{i+1}B)} \lesssim 2^{-(2M+\frac{n}{q})i} \|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(B)}^{-1}. \tag{8.6}$$

Then by (8.3) and (8.6), we conclude that, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, M_i is a constant multiple of a $(\varphi,\ \widetilde{q},\ 0)$-atom. Moreover, from (8.5), it follows that $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} M_i$ converges in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Now we estimate $\|N_{i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_i)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ with $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. By Hölder's inequality and (8.4), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|N_{i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_i)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\lesssim |N_{i+1}||2^iB|^{-\frac{1}{q'}} \lesssim \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} |m_{j+1}||2^iB|^{-\frac{1}{q'}}\\
&\lesssim \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} |2^iB|^{-\frac{1}{q'}} |2^jB|^{\frac{1}{q'}} \|\nabla L^{-1/2}a\|_{L^q(S_j(B))}\\
&\lesssim 2^{-2kM} |B|^{\frac{1}{q}} \|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

From this and Hölder's inequality, similar to the proof of (8.6), we deduce that, for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\|N_{i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_i)\|_{L^{\widetilde{q}}_{\varphi}(2^{i+1}B)} \lesssim 2^{-(2M+\frac{n}{q})i} \|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(B)}^{-1}, \tag{8.8}$$

which, together with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1}(x) - \widetilde{\chi}_i(x))\,dx = 0$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_i) \subset 2^{i+1}B$, implies that, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $N_{i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_i)$ is a constant multiple of a $(\varphi,\ \widetilde{q},\ 0)$-atom. Moreover, by (8.7), we see that $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} N_{i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_i)$ converges in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Thus, (8.2) is an atomic decomposition of $\nabla L^{-1/2}a$ and, furthermore, by (8.6), (8.8), the uniformly lower type p_2 property of φ and $M > \frac{n}{2}(\frac{q_0}{p_2} - \frac{1}{2})$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \varphi\left(2^{i+1}B, \|M_i\|_{L^{\widetilde{q}}_{\varphi}(2^{i+1}B)}\right) + \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \varphi\left(2^{i+1}B, \|N_{i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_i)\|_{L^{\widetilde{q}}_{\varphi}(2^{i+1}B)}\right)\\
&\quad\lesssim \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \varphi\left(2^{i+1}B, 2^{-(2M+\frac{n}{q})i} \|\chi_B\|_{L^{\varphi}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1}\right) \lesssim \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_+} 2^{-(2M+\frac{n}{q})p_2} 2^{knq_0} \lesssim 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.9}$$

Replace a by a_j and, consequently, we then denote M_i, N_i and $\widetilde{\chi}_i$ in (8.2), respectively, by $M_{j,i}$, $N_{j,i}$ and $\widetilde{\chi}_{j,i}$. Similar to (8.2), we know that

$$\nabla L^{-1/2}(f) = \sum_j \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j M_{j,i} + \sum_j \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j N_{j,i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{j,i+1} - \widetilde{\chi}_{j,i}),$$

where, for each j and i, $M_{j,i}$ and $N_{j,i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{j,i+1}-\widetilde{\chi}_{j,i})$ are constant multiples of $(\varphi, \widetilde{q}, 0)$-atoms and the both summations hold true in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and hence in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, from (8.9) with B, M_i, $N_{i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{i+1}-\widetilde{\chi}_i)$ replaced, respectively, by B_j, $M_{j,i}$, $N_{j,i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{j,i+1}-\widetilde{\chi}_{j,i})$, we deduce that

$$\Lambda(\{M_{j,i}\}_{j,i})+\Lambda(\{N_{j,i+1}(\widetilde{\chi}_{j,i+1}-\widetilde{\chi}_{j,i})\}_{j,i})\lesssim\Lambda(\{\lambda_j a_j\}_j)\lesssim\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

By this, we conclude that $\|\nabla L^{-1/2}(f)\|_{H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)}\lesssim\|f\|_{H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, which, together with the fact that $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is dense in $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and a density argument, implies that $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 8.6. $\square$

Moreover, similar to Theorem 7.11, for the Riesz transform $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ associated with the Schrödinger operator L, we also have the following endpoint boundedness.

Theorem 8.6. *Let φ and L be respectively as in Definition 2.2 and* (8.1), *and $i(\varphi)$, $I(\varphi)$, $q(\varphi)$ and $r(\varphi)$ be respectively as in* (2.5), (2.4), (2.6) *and* (2.7). *Assume that $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded on $L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $r\in(1,p_0)$ with some $p_0\in(2,\infty)$, and $\varphi\in\mathbb{A}_1(\mathbb{R}^n)\cap\mathbb{RH}_{(p_0/q(\varphi))'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If $i(\varphi)=\frac{n}{n+1}$ is attainable and $I(\varphi)\in(0,1)$, then $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $WH_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Remark 8.7. (i) Theorem 8.5 improves [74, Theorems 7.11 and 7.15] by widening the range of weights. More precisely, it was proved in [74, Theorems 7.11 and 7.15], respectively, that $\nabla L^{-1/2}$ is bounded from $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $\varphi\in\mathbb{RH}_{2/[2-I(\varphi)]}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and from $H_{\varphi,L}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $H_\varphi(\mathbb{R}^n)$ when $\varphi\in\mathbb{RH}_{2/[2-q(\varphi)]}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. From the assumption $p_0\in(2,\infty)$, it follows that $(p_0/I(\varphi))'<(2/I(\varphi))'=2/[2-I(\varphi)]$ and $(p_0/q(\varphi))'<(2/q(\varphi))'=2/[2-q(\varphi)]$, which, together with Lemma 2.5(iv), implies that

$$\mathbb{RH}_{(2/q(\varphi))'}(\mathbb{R}^n)\subset RH_{(p_0/q(\varphi))'}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Thus, Theorem 8.5 essentially improves [74, Theorems 7.11 and 7.15].

(ii) Theorem 8.6 completely covers [19, Corollary 1.1] by taking $\varphi(x,t):=t^{n/(n+1)}$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and $t\in[0,\infty)$.

The proof of Theorem 8.6 is similar to that of Theorem 7.11. We omit the details here.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank the referees for their careful reading and several valuable remarks which improve the presentation of this article.

References

[1] D. Albrecht, X. T. Duong and A. McIntosh, Operator theory and harmonic analysis, Instructional Workshop on Analysis and Geometry, Part III (Canberra, 1995), 77-136, Proc. Centre Math. Appl. Austral. Nat. Univ., 34, Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 1996.

[2] T. Aoki, Locally bounded linear topological space, Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo 18 (1942), 588-594.

[3] J. Assaad and E. M. Ouhabaz, Riesz transforms of Schrödinger operators on manifolds, J. Geom. Anal. 22 (2012), 1108-1136.

[4] P. Auscher, On necessary and sufficient conditions for L^p-estimates of Riesz transforms associated to elliptic operators on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and related estimates, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 186 (2007), no. 871, xviii+75 pp.

[5] P. Auscher, X. T. Duong and A. McIntosh, Boundedness of Banach space valued singular integral operators and Hardy spaces, Unpublished Manuscript, 2005.

[6] P. Auscher and J. Martell, Weighted norm inequalities, off-diagonal estimates and elliptic operators. I. general operator theory and weights, Adv. Math. 212 (2007), 225-276.

[7] P. Auscher and J. Martell, Weighted norm inequalities, off-diagonal estimates and elliptic operators. II. Off-diagonal estimates on spaces of homogeneous type, J. Evol. Equ. 7 (2007), 265-316.

[8] P. Auscher, A. McIntosh and E. Russ, Hardy spaces of differential forms on Riemannian manifolds, J. Geom. Anal. 18 (2008), 192-248.

[9] P. Auscher and Ph. Tchamitchian, Square root problem for divergence operators and related topics, Astérisque 249 (1998), viii+172 pp.

[10] S. Blunck and P. C. Kunstmann, Weak type (p, p) estimates for Riesz transforms, Math. Z. 247 (2004), 137-148.

[11] S. Blunck and P. Kunstmann, Generalized Gaussian estimates and the Legendre transform, J. Operator Theory 53 (2005), 351-365.

[12] T. A. Bui, J. Cao, L. Ky, D. Yang and S. Yang, Weighted Hardy spaces associated with operators satisfying reinforced off-diagonal estimates, Submitted to Taiwanese J. Math. (2012).

[13] A. Bonami, J. Feuto and S. Grellier, Endpoint for the DIV-CURL lemma in Hardy spaces, Publ. Mat. 54 (2010), 341-358.

[14] A. Bonami and S. Grellier, Hankel operators and weak factorization for Hardy-Orlicz spaces, Colloq. Math. 118 (2010), 107-132.

[15] A. Bonami, S. Grellier and L. D. Ky, Paraproducts and products of functions in $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ through wavelets, J. Math. Pure Appl. 97 (2012), 230-241.

[16] A. Bonami, T. Iwaniec, P. Jones and M. Zinsmeister, On the product of functions in BMO and H^1, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 57 (2007), 1405-1439.

[17] T. A. Bui and X. T. Duong, Weighted Hardy spaces associated to operators and boundedness of singular integrals, arXiv: 1202.2063.

[18] J. Cao and D. Yang, Hardy spaces $H_L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ associated to operators satisfying k-Davies-Gaffney estimates, Sci. China Math. 55 (2012), 1403-1440.

[19] J. Cao, D. Yang and S. Yang, Endpoint boundedness of Riesz transforms on Hardy spaces associated with operators, Rev. Mat. Complut. DOI: 10.1007/s13163-011-0092-5.

[20] R. R. Coifman, A real variable characterization of H^p, Studia Math. 51 (1974), 269-274.

[21] R. R. Coifman, P.-L. Lions, Y. Meyer and S. Semmes, Compensated compactness and Hardy spaces, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 72 (1993), 247-286.

[22] R. R. Coifman, Y. Meyer and E. M. Stein, Some new function spaces and their applications to harmonic analysis, J. Funct. Anal. 62 (1985), 304-335.

[23] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, Analyse Harmonique Non-commutative sur Certains Espaces Homogènes, Lecture Notes in Math., 242, Springer, Berlin, 1971.

[24] T. Coulhon and A. Sikora, Gaussian heat kernel upper bounds via the Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. 96 (2008), 507-544.

[25] M. Cowling, I. Doust, A. McIntosh and A. Yagi, Banach space operators with a bounded H^∞ functional calculus, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A 60 (1996), 51-89.

[26] D. Cruz-Uribe and C. J. Neugebauer, The structure of the reverse Hölder classes, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 347 (1995), 2941-2960.

[27] E. B. Davies, Uniformly elliptic operators with measurable coefficients, J. Funct. Anal. 132 (1995), 141-169.

[28] L. Diening, Maximal function on Musielak-Orlicz spaces and generalized Lebesgue spaces, Bull. Sci. Math. 129 (2005), 657-700.

[29] L. Diening, P. Hästö and S. Roudenko, Function spaces of variable smoothness and integrability, J. Funct. Anal. 256 (2009), 1731-1768.

[30] X. T. Duong and L. Yan, Duality of Hardy and BMO spaces associated with operators with heat kernel bounds, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 18 (2005), 943-973.

[31] C. Fefferman and E. M. Stein, H^p spaces of several variables, Acta Math. 129 (1972), 137-195.

[32] M. Gaffney, The conservation property of the heat equation on Riemannian manifolds, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 12 (1959) 1-11.

[33] J. García-Cuerva, Weighted H^p spaces, Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) 162 (1979), 1-63.

[34] J. García-Cuerva and J. Rubio de Francia, Weighted Norm Inequalities and Related Topics, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 1985.

[35] L. Grafakos, Modern Fourier Analysis, Second edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 250, Springer, New York, 2009.

[36] L. Greco and T. Iwaniec, New inequalities for the Jacobian, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 11 (1994), 17-35.

[37] E. Harboure, O. Salinas and B. Viviani, A look at $\mathrm{BMO}_\phi(\omega)$ through Carleson measures, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 13 (2007), 267-284.

[38] M. Haase, The Functional Calculus for Sectorial Operators, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, 169. Birkhäser Verlag, Basel, 2006.

[39] S. Hofmann, G. Lu, D. Mitrea, M. Mitrea and L. Yan, Hardy spaces associated to non-negative self-adjoint operators satisfying Davies-Gaffney estimates, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 214 (2011), no. 1007, vi+78 pp.

[40] S. Hofmann and S. Mayboroda, Hardy and BMO spaces associated to divergence form elliptic operators, Math. Ann. 344 (2009), 37-116.

[41] S. Hofmann, S. Mayboroda and A. McIntosh, Second order elliptic operators with complex bounded measurable coefficients in L^p, Sobolev and Hardy spaces, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 44 (2011), 723-800.

[42] S. Hou, D. Yang and S. Yang, Lusin area function and molecular characterizations of Musielak-Orlicz Hardy spaces and their applications, arXiv: 1201.1945.

[43] T. Iwaniec and C. Sbordone, Weak minima of variational integrals, J. Reine Angew. Math. 454 (1994), 143-161.

[44] S. Janson, Generalizations of Lipschitz spaces and an application to Hardy spaces and bounded mean oscillation, Duke Math. J. 47 (1980), 959-982.

[45] R. Jiang and D. Yang, Orlicz-Hardy spaces associated with operators satisfying Davies-Gaffney estimates, Commun. Contemp. Math. 13 (2011), 331-373.

[46] R. Jiang and D. Yang, New Orlicz-Hardy spaces associated with divergence form elliptic operators, J. Funct. Anal. 258 (2010), 1167-1224.

[47] R. Jiang, D. Yang and Y. Zhou, Orlicz-Hardy spaces associated with operators, Sci. China Ser. A 52 (2009), 1042-1080.

[48] R. Johnson and C. J. Neugebauer, Homeomorphisms preserving A_p, Rev. Mat. Ibero. 3 (1987), 249-273.

[49] L. D. Ky, New Hardy spaces of Musielak-Orlicz type and boundedness of sublinear operators, arXiv: 1103.3757.

[50] L. D. Ky, Bilinear decompositions and commutators of singular integral operators, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear) or arXiv: 1105.0486.

[51] L. D. Ky, Endpoint estimates for commutators of singular integrals related to Schrödinger operators, arXiv:1203.6335.

[52] L. D. Ky, Bilinear decompositions for the product space $H^1_L \times BMO_L$, arXiv:1204.3041.

[53] L. D. Ky, On weak*-convergence in $H^1_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, arXiv:1205.2542.

[54] R. H. Latter, A characterization of $H^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in terms of atoms, Studia Math. 62 (1978), 93-101.

[55] A. K. Lerner, Some remarks on the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function on variable L^p spaces, Math. Z. 251 (2005), 509-521.

[56] Y. Liang, J. Huang and D. Yang, New real-variable characterizations of Hardy spaces of Musielak-Orlicz type, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 395 (2012), 413-428.

[57] Y. Liang, D. Yang and S. Yang, Applications of Orlicz-Hardy spaces associated with operators satisfying Poisson estimates, Sci. China Math. 54 (2011), 2395-2426.

[58] A. McIntosh, Operators which have an H_∞ functional calculus, Miniconference on operator theory and partial differential equations (North Ryde, 1986), 210-231, Proc. Centre Math. Anal., Austral. Nat. Univ., 14, Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 1986.

[59] J. Musielak, Orlicz Spaces and Modular Spaces, Lecture Notes in Math., 1034, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[60] E. Nakai, Pointwise multipliers on weighted BMO spaces, Studia Math. 125 (1997), 35, 35-56.

[61] E. Nakai and K. Yabuta, Pointwise multipliers for functions of bounded mean oscillation, J. Math. Soc. Japan 37 (1985), 207-218.

[62] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, Theory of Orlicz Spaces, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 146, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1991.

[63] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, Applications of Orlicz Spaces, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 250, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 2002.

[64] S. Rolewicz, On a certain class of linear metric spaces, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Cl. III. 5 (1957), 471-473.

- [65] E. Russ, The atomic decomposition for tent spaces on spaces of homogeneous type, CMA/AMSI Research Symposium "Asymptotic Geometric Analysis, Harmonic Analysis, and Related Topics", 125-135, Proc. Centre Math. Appl., 42, Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 2007.
- [66] S. Semmes, A primer on Hardy spaces, and some remarks on a theorem of Evans and Müller, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 19 (1994), 277-319.
- [67] L. Song and L. Yan, Riesz transforms associated to Schrödinger operators on weighted Hardy spaces, J. Funct. Anal. 259 (2010), 1466-1490.
- [68] J.-O. Strömberg, Bounded mean oscillation with Orlicz norms and duality of Hardy spaces, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 28 (1979), 511-544.
- [69] J.-O. Strömberg and A. Torchinsky, Weighted Hardy Spaces, Lecture Notes in Math., 1381, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [70] E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, On the theory of harmonic functions of several variables. I. The theory of H^p-spaces, Acta Math. 103 (1960), 25-62.
- [71] D. Yang and S. Yang, Orlicz-Hardy spaces associated with divergence operators on unbounded strongly Lipschitz domains of $\mathbb{R}^n$, Indiana Univ. Math. J. (to appear) or arXiv:1107.2971.
- [72] D. Yang and S. Yang, Real-variable characterizations of Orlicz-Hardy spaces on strongly Lipschitz domains of $\mathbb{R}^n$, Rev. Mat. Ibero. 29 (2013, to appear) or arXiv:1107.3267.
- [73] D. Yang and S. Yang, Local Hardy spaces of Musielak-Orlicz type and their applications, Sci. China Math. 55 (2012), 1677-1720.
- [74] D. Yang and S. Yang, Musielak-Orlicz Hardy spaces associated with operators and their applications, J. Geom. Anal. (2012), DOI: 10.1007/s12220-012-9344-y or arXiv: 1201.5512.
- [75] K. Yosida, Functional Analysis, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

The Anh Bui

Department of Mathematics, Macquarie University, NSW 2109, Australia and Department of Mathematics, University of Pedagogy, Ho chi Minh city, Vietnam

E-mails: `the.bui@mq.ed.au` and `bt_anh80@yahoo.com`

Jun Cao, Dachun Yang (Corresponding author) and Sibei Yang

School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems, Ministry of Education, Beijing 100875, People's Republic of China

E-mails: `caojun1860@mail.bnu.edu.cn` (J. Cao)
`dcyang@bnu.edu.cn` (D. Yang)
`yangsibei@mail.bnu.edu.cn` (S. Yang)

Luong Dang Ky

MAPMO-UMR 6628, Département de Mathématiques, Université d'Orleans, 45067 Orléans Cedex 2, France

E-mails: `dangky@math.cnrs.fr`